NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from
Government of Maharashtra
on 30 January, 2020

DIVISIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY

IN EAST AND WEST.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

CHRISTENDOM'S DIVISIONS.

BEING A PHILOSOPHICAL SKETCH OF THE DIVISIONS OF

THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY IN EAST AND WEST.

TO BE FOLLOWED BY A HISTORY
OF THE DIFFERENT RE-UNIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN PROJECTED IN
BOTH UP TO THE PRESENT TIME.

68218 a 154
a2

BY

EDMUND S. FFOULKES

FORMERLY FELLOW AND TUTOR OF JESUS COLLEGE, OXFORD.

'Christianus sum: Christiani nihil a me alienum puto.'
CHREMES RENATUS.

E g 43

LONDON:
LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, & GREEN.
1865.

00068218

PREFACE.

TWO YEARS AGO a book was put into my hands by my old friend Mr. Lumley, of New Oxford Street, apropos of the subject which we were then discussing, as having been mentioned in high terms of approval by that genuine Churchman, and genuine Englishman equally, the late Mr. Charles Butler. Its title was 'Histoire Critique des Projets formés depuis Trois Cents Ans pour la Réunion des Communions Chrétiennes.' It had been written by M. Tabaraud, priest of the French Oratory; its contents betokened great research and discrimination; and it had passed through two editions, of which this, the second, came out in A.D. 1824.

This work it was which induced me to set about throwing my thoughts and materials into shape like the present. At one time I thought of merely translating M. Tabaraud; at another time, of adding to him as well; and, at length, decided upon recasting his materials with additions. His facts were in many cases new to me, and seemed exhaustive; but when I came to enquire whether any further materials were to be had, I obtained access to such quantities of curious tracts and manuscripts having ecclesiastical negotiations for their subject, in the libraries of Lambeth, Bodley, Jesus, and Christ Church, Oxford, alone—through the kindness of their respective authorities—that it never would have done to have

adhered too rigidly to any preconceived plan. Then, when I reflected that, as for the last 300 years there had been all the different overtures between Catholics and Protestants, described by M. Tabaraud: so, likewise, for the 300 or 400 years preceding, there had been at least as many negotiations of a similar kind, and for a similar purpose, between Greeks and Latins: it seemed to me that neither should be disconnected or considered apart from the other; and that from both combined a powerful moral might be elicited on the general tendency of Christianity to draw men together, in spite of their worst differences, proving it to be quite as abhorrent of divisions in itself as nature ever was of a vacuum. The divisions of Christendom, notorious and interminable as they may have become, would, at all events, have been met by another fact as broad, could it be shown that, ever since they commenced, a series of attempts had been made in every succeeding age, by Christians so widely differing from each other in general temperament, or acquired habits of thought, as Easterns and Westerns, Catholics and Protestants, for restoring visible intercommunion amongst themselves.

Again, it appeared to be no less true that the thing had been so often attempted, than that it had as often failed. What, therefore, were the grounds for both? Men do not usually, with their eyes open, persist in attempting what is absolutely hopeless; neither are they apt to fail again and again in any one project for no assignable cause. Hence, besides bringing out the fact itself, I felt called upon to enquire into these two points connected with it—namely, its constant recurrence, and as constant failure. By inquiring into the grounds upon which Christians are divided, first—in their widest possible aspect—I may hope to show how far their differences may be supposed really capable of any adjust-

ment. Then, secondly, while going into the historical details of every successive scheme for reunion that has been set on foot, I may be able to determine whether its failure was due to adventitious or accidental causes, or to the general hopelessness of the thing attempted.

By way of preface to the divisions of Christendom, there are two or three separate appeals which I cannot forbear making, both for the purpose of bespeaking interest in the abstract subject, and of getting that subject considered as it should be.

1. What would be thought of the scholarship of that man who professed to lecture on the speeches in Thucydides, the choruses of Æschylus and Euripides, the satires of Persius, or the annals of Tacitus, while betraying every now and then his inability to construe and parse plain easy sentences in Latin and Greek Delectus? But this is surely just what Christendom has been doing, for some time past, by its inspired classics. It has been disputing and expending a vast amount of apparent learning upon some passages of acknowledged intricacy, respecting the Infallibility of the Church, the Supremacy of the Pope, Apostolical Succession, Inherent or Imputed Righteousness, Original Sin, Baptismal Regeneration, and the Real Presence—in all which, undoubtedly, there is a right interpretation to be upheld, and a wrong interpretation to be condemned; one view which is true, and another view which is false; one line of action which is in harmony with the commands of Christ, and another line which is not. Still, as undeniably, when all those passages have been brought together, and enumerated and contrasted, they will be seen to be either few in number, or recondite in meaning; our conclusions will be found in each case to be based either upon the literal sense of two or three isolated texts, or upon deductions

from a number of texts mutually supporting or balanced against each other. They are, on the whole, like the obscure passages, or unique constructions, or terms of rare occurrence, to be met with in Thucydides, Æschylus, Persius, and other classical authors. Meanwhile, there are some simple sentences for beginners occurring over and over again in the New Testament which it would seem from our practice we are unable to parse or construe; though, with the help of grammar and dictionary, there must be few incapable of penetrating to their full meaning. 'A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another, as I have loved you, that ye also love one another.[1] . . . . If ye love me, keep my commandments.[2] . . . . This is my commandment, that ye love one another.[3] . . . . Owe no man anything, but to love one another.[4] . . . Love is the fulfilling of the law'[5] . . . and so forth. Is not the grammar of these sentences sufficiently clear? Is there one word in them which is ambiguous? 'Good Master,' said one, 'what shall I do that I may have eternal life?' And Jesus answered—first repeating the question, that there might be no mistake about it—'If thou wilt enter into life'—and then employing, in His reply, the very terms in which He afterwards laid down the true criterion of our love to Him—'Keep the commandments.'[6]

In all other cases, common-sense forbids our ever indulging in the sophistry that by keeping one commandment we may break another, and not incur punishment. Those who steal are not let off because they do not commit murder as well; those who give way to their lusts, without violating truth, are

[1] S. John xiii. 34.
[2] Ibid. xiv. 15.
[3] Ibid. xv. 12.
[4] Rom. xiii. 8.
[5] Ibid. v. 10.
[6] S. Math. xix. 17. *Τήρησον τὰς ἐντολάς.* as S. John xiv. 15, above cited, *Ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτέ με, τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς τηρήσατε.*

not supposed to escape with impunity. Therefore, when I contemplate Christendom obstinately quarrelling over its more recondite obligations from age to age, and yet so notoriously unmindful of this primary and most undoubted one, I can only suppose that we are all of us bad scholars (*καρτ' ἀπόμουσοι*), unable to construe and parse those plain and easy sentences which recur so often in the course of the New Testament, and whose construction and whose terms are so trite that they can have but one meaning.

2. Bad scholars! and can we call ourselves any better philosophers? One of the first axioms in Moral Philosophy is, that the end is of more value than the means. When the end has been attained, the value of the means comes out, and is acknowledged; but when the end has been sacrificed to the means, the means is apt to be regarded with prejudice, and even aversion, as having been inadequate, or otherwise in fault. Now the hierarchy is a means to the Sacraments, and the Sacraments a means to unite men to Christ as their Head, and to each other as His members. 'By one Spirit,' says the Apostle, 'are we all baptized into one Body.'[7] Just two chapters before, he had said, in reference to the Holy Eucharist, 'We being many are one Bread and one Body; for we are all partakers of that one Bread.'[8] Thus union with Christ, and with each other, is unequivocally stated to be the joint end of both Sacraments; and those Sacraments are only instrumental to that union, as the hierarchy is instrumental to those Sacraments. To quarrel about the Sacraments, therefore, is to frustrate their appointed purpose, and to sacrifice the integrity of the end to the means; to quarrel about the hierarchy is to quarrel about a means to a means. It may be bold language, but I am persuaded in my own

[7] 1 Cor. xii. 13. [8] Ibid. x. 17.

mind that half of the discredit which has attached to the Sacraments and to the hierarchy, in modern days, is to be traced to the *fact* that they have come to divide Christendom, instead of uniting it, with whomsoever the fault may rest. If they continue to unite Christians to Christ, they have long ceased to unite Christians to each other. As long as controversy turned principally upon those articles of the creed which relate to God, Christendom, on the whole, maintained its unity; its breaches commenced, and have gone on widening, ever since it engaged in questions relating to man. Its anthropology, not its theology, has divided it; and the 'New Commandment' of Christ has been set aside, forsooth, that His Sacraments and hierarchy may be better honoured or understood—undermined or explained away.

3. My third appeal is to my countrymen. Englishmen, of all others, should know by this time that there is no one form of government that is perfect or incapable of abuses, and that there is no one form under which it is not possible to live in comparative security and independence, so long as men are true to themselves, and act in concert for the maintenance of their just rights. Monarchy may, as in our own case, be combined with the greatest possible amount of personal liberty and respect for law. Democracy may end in no law at all but the variable will of the multitude. When men are oppressed, or have lost their liberty, it is apt to be through their own fault, or the fault of their forefathers, and not only their misfortune. Look at the history of our own country. There was a time when it was a common doctrine among theologians and statesmen that kings reigned by divine right! Is it to be wondered that our own monarchs, hearing their prerogatives so magnified by those who had studied them most, should have tried occasionally to substitute their own will for

law? The country resisted them, and they were undeceived. Monarchy was not abolished amongst us; but it assented to become constitutional. It set that example of obedience to law which has been so universally followed. It is not possible for all classes of society to enjoy greater freedom of thought, speech, and action on earth than they have with us; yet of what priceless value is that tie which, under the name of constitutional monarchy, links us together as one people, and keeps the peace between us all! What innumerable shades and varieties of opinions are content to look up to it as their supreme arbiter! Suppose it gone — suppose all titles and distinctions, of which it is the fountain, gone with it; no more dukes or earls, no more judges or bishops, no more lord-lieutenants of counties or magistrates; but all of us suddenly transformed into plain citizens, with our indomitable spirit of independence, our exuberant population, our highly-wrought civilisation unchanged. Is there any one form of government on which we should be likely to agree, or which could be set up without incalculable sacrifice of liberty and loss of life? All our industrial employments would be suspended, our progress, as a nation, might be thrown back for centuries while we were getting into shape once more; and after all, under the most favourable circumstances, could we but hope to come back to the some point again from which we started?

Why should it be thought otherwise with the constitution of the Church? With the exception of its Apostolical or Divine origin, its superior length of days, and extent and variety of subjects and territory, its whole history is word for word with our own. If it be a monarchy, certainly we ought to be the last people in the world to quarrel with it on that score. Were England and the whole Christian world synonymous, that form of government which has been continued

in the Church of England would only require to be administered with greater freedom to be perfection, and Christendom would then be one, as the Church of England is one now. It is because England is only one of many countries professing Christianity that a more comprehensive system, not in principle but in details, is necessary; culminating in one who is Archbishop, not of Canterbury, nor Paris, nor Vienna, nor Constantinople, but of the whole body. If Englishmen had no concern in any Christianity but their own, their retirement from the Amphictyonic league of Christian nations might be excusable; as it is, their exclusiveness is as difficult to reconcile with the first principles of Christianity as with the most Divine form of patriotism.

> Hæc duri immota Catonis
> Secta fuit . . . patriæque impendere vitam:
> Nec sibi, sed toti genitum se credere mundo.[9]

That line, one would imagine, should embody both the principle and practice of every Christian nation. It must be read backwards to be made applicable to Christian—I do not say commercial—England for the last three centuries. It is a favourite charge made by Englishmen against the Church, with which they once rejoiced to be in communion, that it is opposed to progress. This is, emphatically, to add insult to injury. Be the charge ever so true, with whom does the principal blame rest but with those who are making it? They withdrew themselves from it three centuries ago, and they now complain that it wants one of those features which would have been sure to have been conspicuous in it had they remained. The secession of the entire North from the Church cannot have been without effect upon it, so far as any one of those characteristics is concerned, in which the North

[9] Lucan, *Civ.* b. ii. 380.

excels. To be stationary, belongs to the East and South; to be moving, to the North and West. France and Belgium are the only two nations of progress remaining in communion with it; and, naturally enough, there are bounds to their influence. What might not the career of that Church be—I am speaking of it in its earthly relations—were France and England allied, as in diplomacy, so upon each ecclesiastical question, as it came up, and fully resolved to make their joint influence felt in its settlement? He that would deny progress to have been a law of the Church in the Middle Ages, is shutting his eyes to the civilisation of Europe by means of the Church: he who persists in affirming the action of the Church to be still all that it used to be, before the North had been decatholicised, is simply shutting his eyes to things as they are.

What, therefore, has been the object of my appeals? Is it a plea for Rome? Certainly not, in the ordinary or exclusive sense. It is a plea for Christianity. During the early part of my life, I was taught to reverence bishops and archbishops—and for the last ten years, I have not learned to reverence Pope and cardinals otherwise than—as instrumental to the maintenance of the faith of Christ crucified upon earth, and the propagation of the saving effects of His holy religion, from generation to generation, in the heart of man. Where they have discharged that task faithfully and efficiently, there is no class of men entitled to more respect and honour at our hands—for they act the part of the best and truest philanthropists. Where they have discharged that task ill, or made it subservient to their own interests or aggrandisement, there can be no greater enemies of the whole human race. For they have poisoned the wells from which only living waters should flow; they have alienated man from those heavenly prescriptions that would have effected his cure.

It would be unjust, and contrary to fact, to insinuate that nothing else but their rivalries and backslidings, their subtleties and fine-drawn distinctions, have caused our divisions; nevertheless, I must certainly think that it will always depend upon the clergy, mainly, whether they shall be healed or not. There is no constitution in the world that is so comprehensive, or so liberal, so favourable to peace, so abhorrent of any distinctions of race or caste, as that of the Church, if it is only carried out in its integrity, without allowing any one part of it to domineer over the rest. There never was any religion, as that of Christ, so congenial to our highest instincts, so persuasive, so ennobling, so universally acceptable to rich and poor, so worthy of the intellect, so consistent and uncompromising in its rules for advancing moral excellence. Men could not, would not, turn from it, if it was properly brought home to them; if it was not tendered to them with some admixture of earth about it, exciting their suspicions, and robbing it of its heavenly fragrance. Even bread and wine may be so adulterated as to disagree with us. But, with what hope can we look forward to the future of mankind, should Christianity ever cease to be the spiritual food of man? We are surrounded by wrecks of former civilisations that have passed away, because they had nothing in them but what was of man. We are surrounded by pictures of man in his lowest and most degraded state still. We know what our own forefathers were before they had received the Gospel. We know what we have gradually become ourselves, since it has been our rule of life. But is not the continuance of that Gospel imperilled on all sides by the divisions of those who profess it? Instead of drawing men together by it, we seem employing it everywhere as a means of alienating them more and more from each other. Not only have the old landmarks of

divisions been perpetuated with obstinacy, but bodies, separated from each other, have come to quarrel amongst themselves. And the principle of elimination adopted by all appears to be, not the casting out of their evildoers and immoral livers, but rather the casting out of active, serious, and devoted Christians, who may have published or expressed opinions, obnoxious indeed to the majority, or the dominant party, but not therefore necessarily opposed to any one article of their respective creeds. People are never more sensitive than when they are conscious of having quarrelled with somebody. There have been many such eliminations in the Episcopal Church of England, in the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland and Switzerland, among Wesleyans, Baptists, and other minor communities—and in the Roman Catholic Church as well—within memory, and they are still going on. It may be, therefore, that things will become still more paradoxical than they are. According to the ancient creeds, there is but one Holy Catholic Church upon earth— that is, according to the Roman Catholic theory, that body which is in communion with the Pope Nor, indeed, according to facts, is there any other body capable of having the epithets 'one' and 'catholic' both applied to it with any truth. But it is part of that theory likewise that heretical baptism is valid. In that case, therefore, there are about half as many baptized Christians outside the Church as there are in it. According to the Greek theory, baptism, to be valid, must have been administered in the Greek Church. In that case, both Catholics and Protestants can belong to no Church at all, and are not even Christians. According to the Protestant theory, there are as many Churches as there are Christian communities. In that case, there can be no Catholic Church at all upon earth that is one. For destructive purposes, it is curious to observe how all three

theories act in harmony. The Protestant subverts the notion of any Catholic Church at all; the Greek, the notion that Catholics or Protestants in the West have any part in it; the Roman Catholic, the notion that Greeks or Protestants have any part in it. How humiliating, how utterly unworthy of the name of Christians, whichever way we look at it; almost enough, of itself, to have the effect of making men infidels! In what amiable relief to it all stands out that practice, universally current throughout Christendom even now, of administering communion to all persons presenting themselves for it, not having been actually excommunicated! The large-heartedness which prevailed when Christendom was one, peeps out now and then unawares even in its divided state. The spirit of Christianity says still, as it did 2,500 years ago, 'Ho! *everyone* that thirsteth, *come* ye to the waters,' &c.; and the spirit of man shrinks from saying, in so many words, 'They have become private property'—even while putting forward views calculated to beget that impression.

Once more to revert to facts—If it be true that there are as many Christians in the world as there are persons who have received Christian baptism, the Roman Catholic Church numbers about 200,000,000 souls, and all other Christian communities together about half that number. Were those numbers reversed, which they may easily become, should the process of elimination proceed as briskly as is sometimes threatened, that body claiming to be the Catholic Church would be less numerous by half than the rest of Christendom, on its own showing; it might go on eliminating till it became as a part to the whole. Even now, as applied to the Roman Catholic Church, those words of St. Augustine, 'securus judicat orbis terrarum,' of which we have heard so much of late, whatever they may retain in principle, have long ceased to

express a fact: North America in the West, Russia and Greece in the East, England and Scotland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark in the North of Europe, being Christian nations, and yet exceptions to it. Evidently there is cause for alarm in the course which things are taking, no matter to which side we belong.

The moral of my book will be, that there have been secret misgivings in the mind of Christendom that all was not right, ever since its divisions commenced: and who that reflects upon them can think them unfounded? There is little in the present attitude of Christians towards each other which any one of us can be proud of; and there is a vast deal, surely, which all who love Christ and His holy religion must feel it to be their duty to take to heart, and labour to do all in their power to remedy! Here, then, is my mite towards it—

'Doctor Gentium, ora pro nobis.'

Feast of the Conversion of S. Paul, 1865.

86 Sloane Street, S.W.

CONTENTS.

SECT.		PAGE
1.	Ecclesiastical History—Compared with other Histories	2 to 3
2.	Historical Continuities—Jewish and Church History	4 — 5
3.	Sustained Parallelism in the Annals of Both Revelations—Providence and Freewill Harmonised	6 — 8
4.	Israel and Judah under Kings	9
5.	Origin of Church Government—Synods peculiar to the Church—Centralisation in the Empire	10 — 12
6.	Christianity First Preached in Capitals—Rise of Metropolitans	13 — 14
7.	Origin of Patriarchs	15
8.	Power of Emperors over the Church—Emperors Originated General Councils—A New Species of Representation—Universal Monarchy thereby Suggested—Appeals Carried before Emperors—How their Power ceased	16 — 21
9.	Early Prerogatives of Rome—Founded by the Two Greatest Apostles—Were its Rights based on Divine Law?	21 — 24
10.	Characteristics of the See of Rome—Seat of Empire removed from Rome	24 — 26
11.	Rival to Rome in Constantinople—Questions affecting the Papacy	26 — 28
12.	Theocracy and Christocracy—Ideal Polity	28 — 30
13.	Argument for the Actual Form—Practical View of the Case	30 — 32
14.	Two Alternatives for the Church—Arguments for a Supreme Head—Witness of National Churches—General Assent to the Principle	32 — 35
15.	The Ideal more fit for the Cloister—The Actual sanctioned in the Synagogue and in the Church	35 — 37

SECT.		PAGE
16.	Eastern and Western Peculiarities compatible with Intercommunion	37 to 39
17.	Causes of Rupture between East and West reducible to Three Heads	39 — 40
18.	Sin the Principal Cause—Horrors of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries—Instances at Rome and Constantinople—Complaint of Ratherius—Complaint of Canute—Forebodings of Peter of Antioch	40 — 45
19.	Second Cause—Rise of the Temporal Power—The Whole West a Party to it—Moral Power against Brute Force	45 to 48
20.	Temporal Pretensions and Possessions of the Roman See—Popes Discrown before they Crown—Temporalities of the Popes—Donation of Pepin and Others to them	48 — 52
21.	Rome and Constantinople in their Altered Relations	52 — 53
22.	Principle of Centralisation—Its Merits and Natural Results—Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes favorable to its Development	53 — 57
23.	Just Rights of the Pope, and of his Subjects—General Position of the East and West—Possible Changes	57 — 59
24.	Third Cause—Addition to the Creed, simultaneous with its Public Use—Spain and France the First, Rome the Last to adopt it—Instincts of East and West	59 — 64
25.	Doctrine Involved in that Addition—Works of East and West—Curious Paradoxes	64 — 66
26.	Plagiarisms from Africa—S. Athanasius and S. Austin	66 — 67
27.	Christian Theology in the East—Few Theologians in the West	67 — 68
28.	Early Western Instincts—Specimens of their Manifestation	68 — 69
29.	Creed Interpolated by the West, as it commenced its Work—The Double Procession its Motto—Regarded from Two Different Aspects—Kindred Doctrine of Greeks and Latins	69 — 72
30.	Western Plagiarisms and Originalities—Application of the Incarnation to Man—Theory of the Sacraments—Regeneration of Society	72 — 75
31.	Specimens of Greek Treatises—S. Cyril and S. John Damascene	75 — 76
32.	Latin Treatises—The Book of the Sentences—The Great Work of S. Thomas—Art and Science Regenerated	76 — 79
33.	Councils of East and West—Digests of their Canons contrasted	79 — 80

SECT.		PAGE
34.	Subject-matter of Eastern Canons—Attention bestowed on the Creed	80 to 81
35.	Topics handled in Western Councils—Creed and Canons of Innocent III.—Emperors and Popes deposed	81—83
36.	Penitential System due to the West—Originated by Novatianism—Office of Penitentiary—Rise of Penitentials	83—86
37.	Heresies passing from West to East propagate no Theological Errors—Pelagius and Novatus in the East	86—87
38.	Heresies passing from East to West affect Manners as well as Doctrine—Montanism and Manichæism—Capital Punishments decreed against both—Gnostics and Catharists—Developments of the Latter	87—91
39.	Heresies of the West essentially Anthropological—Punished as against Society	91—92
40.	Christian Anthropology: Objective and Subjective—The First the Work of the Middle Ages	93—94
41.	Subjective Anthropology not studied by the Schoolmen	94—95
42.	The Point really raised by Luther—Relevancy of his Appeal—Personal Experiences—Individuals and the Inductive Method	95 to 98
43.	The Council of Trent—The Subjects Ruled by it—What it only Confirmed—Summary of its Teaching	98—101
44.	Christian Anthropology recapitulated—Office of the Holy Ghost	101—102
45.	The Immaculate Conception—How a Corollary to the whole Subject—Parallel of S. John Baptist	103—105
46.	Teaching of the West accepted practically by the East	105—106
47.	Heresies of the East contrasted with Mohammedanism—The Cross supplanted by the Crescent	106—108
48.	Inconsistency of the Koran—Christ how Dethroned by it—Mohammed in what sense Antichrist—His Appeal to the Law and the Gospel	108—111
49.	Mohammed as a Civiliser and a De-civiliser—Literature amongst Mohammedans—Christian Janissaries and Pashas—The Crescent never passed to America	111—115
50.	Excuse for Mohammedanism—Christian Sects in the East—Schisms amongst Mohammedans—Form of renouncing Christianity	115—118
51.	Mohammed and Luther compared—Their Points of Resemblance—Mohammedan and Lutheran Chiefs	118—120

SECT.		PAGE
52.	Grand Difference between Mohammed and Luther—Luther Anti-church, not Antichrist—Faith and Baptism as Principles—Characteristics of Baptism	120 to 122
53.	Subject continued—Faith the First of Subjective Dispositions—Appeal to the Plain Text of the Bible—Luther's real Heterodoxy—Moehler on Lutheranism	122—126
54.	Errors of Luther weighed against Corruptions in the Church—Things were mending as Luther appeared . . .	126—128
55.	Difficulties in the Way of Reform everywhere—Especially in the Church—Ordinary Fate of Reformers . . .	128—130
56.	Corruptions of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries—Extenuating Circumstances—Residence of the Popes at Avignon	130—132
57.	Councils of Pisa and Constance—Reformation of the Whole Church demanded—Martin's Letter to Henry VI.—Reform Commission appointed	132—135
58.	Councils of Basle and Florence—Nicholas V. on Papal Jurisdiction—Danger from the Turks	135—137
59.	Dark Period of Forty Years.—Creations of Cardinals—Indulgences	137—138
60.	Julius II. and Leo X.—Fifth Lateran Council—Speech of the Bishop of Modrusch—Speech of Leo X. . . .	138—141
61.	'Bulla Reformationis Curiæ'—Mild Measures against Nepotism—Two Remarkable Speeches—Golden Opportunity lost	141—144
62.	Adrian VI.—His Instructions to Chieregato—Remarks upon Alexander VI.—The Disease Deep-seated . . .	144—146
63.	Clement VII.: his Ill-starred Pontificate—Letters of Cardinal Sadolet—Replies to Archbishops John and Hermann—Letters of Contarini to Pole and to Paul III.—Erroneous Doctrine on the Papal Power—Candour of the Cardinal in opposing it	146—151
64.	'Consilium Delectorum Cardinalium'—Authorship ascribed to Pole—Remarkable Appeal to the Pope . . .	151—156
65.	Bishops who turned Protestants—Bishop Hosius and John Sturmius—Plea for Seceders	154—156
66.	Opening of the Council of Trent—Different Treatment of Luther and Arius—Acts of the Council only became Law in A. D. 1564	156—158

SECT.		PAGE
67.	Reforms of the Council of Trent—No Authentic Copy of the Acts yet Published—Fatal Policy of Paul IV. . . .	158 to 160
68.	Excellent Measures of Pius IV.—Bulls for Reforming the Curia—Measures against Pluralism	160—162
69.	Questors of Alms abolished—Traffic in Indulgences forbidden—Tone of the Decrees on Reformation—Speeches made towards the Close of the Council—Impassioned Words of Ferrerius	162—166
70.	Reforms of the Council of Trent continued—Sentiments of Pius IV.—Hurried Reforms of the last Month—Facts not to be Passed Over	166—169
71.	Sequel of Events—Catholic Corruptions and Protestant Doctrines—Successes and Reverses on Both Sides—Some Promised Reforms never Carried Out	169—172
72.	Gradual Relapse—Praiseworthy Efforts of Innocent XI.—Lateran Council of A. D. 1725—Aspirations of Benedict XIII.	172—175
73.	Striking Letter of S. Alphonso Liguori—Advice to the Successor of Clement XIV.	175—176
74.	State of the Church of France under Louis XV.—Letter of Aymon to Archbishop Wake—Letter of Fenelon to Clement XI.—Ferment created by the Bull 'Unigenitus' . .	176—179
75.	Ecclesiastical Intrigues—How Dubois became Cardinal—Prophecy about Monks in France—Reflections from Sismondi—Bright Side of the Picture	179—182
76.	Excellent Character of the Popes since the Reformation—Saintly Men and Women—Justice for the Jesuits—Fatal Bull of Clement XIV.—Jesuits restored by Pius VII.—Noble Deeds of the Society of Jesus—Spiritual Exercises of S. Ignatius	182—188
77.	Victories achieved by the Church in the Age following the Council of Trent—Weak Points of Protestantism—Vicissitudes of Protestantism	188—190
78.	Protestantism and its Works—Biblical and General Criticism—Protestants Fellow-workers with Catholics . .	191—193
79.	Rise of the Inductive Sciences—Deductive Science worked out in the Middle Ages	193—194
80.	Collision between the Deductive and Inductive Methods—The Inductive Method when Necessary—Writers upon Christian Evidences	194—196

SECT.		PAGE
81.	Refutation of Deism by the Church of England—Syllogistic Form of the Controversy—Rome and England in the same Cause	196 to 198
82.	Unique Position of the Church of England—Church Revenues in England and elsewhere—De Maistre on the Anglican Church—Apostolical Succession claimed	198—201
83.	Lingard on Parker's Consecration—Consecrators of the Old and New Rite—Archbishop of Dublin might have been had—Relations of Dublin to Canterbury of old	201—204
84.	Church of England never doubtful of, or indifferent to, its Episcopal Succession—Speculations on the Visit of the Archbishop of Spalato—Father Courayer on Anglican Orders—Church of England in respect of Dogma	204—207
85.	Of the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles—Old Service-books why abandoned—Cardinal Quignon's Breviary—Ambiguities of the Common Prayer-Book—Contrast of the Old Sarum Missal	207—211
86.	Missal and Breviary of Pius V.—Antiphons to the Blessed Virgin—Origin of Invoking Saints—Conservative Character of the New Breviary—Assumptions of the Common Prayer-Book—Saints of the Mediæval Church true Saints	211—216
87.	Character of the Thirty-nine Articles—Grave Breach with the Past—Law of the Church of England for 1200 years—Teaching of General Councils abandoned—Un-English Policy	216—220
88.	Present Position of the Church of England no mere Quarrel with Rome—Consecration of the Eucharist in Schism	221—223
89.	Examination continued on *à posteriori* Grounds—Peculiarities of the Church of England—Anglican Writers and their Merits—Questions discussed or to be discussed—Unity of the Church—Christian Lives in the Church of England	223—228
90.	Schism and its Extenuating Circumstances.—Conscientiousness on Both Sides—Remarkable Words of Urban VIII.—Quarrels between Seculars and Regulars—Unedifying Intrigues—Father Conn on the Revolution of A.D. 1688—The Church in England overborne by the State—Good Deeds of England to Catholicism	228—236
91.	Hidden Sympathy between England and Rome—Catholics and Protestants Brethren by Baptism—The Whole Truth still to be Told	236—238

SECT.		PAGE
92.	Unearthly Side of Church History—Authentic History Due to Revelation—Greece and Rome wanted for Christianity—History under the Law and under the Gospel—Jewish and Church History	238 to 242
93.	Same Subject continued—Interdependence of Jewish and Church History	243—244
94.	One History, but not the History of One People—Testimony of the Jews to Christianity	244—245
95.	Divisions in the Hand of God—Testimonies to the Truth of the Gospel	245—246
96.	Benefits of Christianity—Reply of Miramolin to King John—What Christianity would do with Free Scope	246—248
97.	The Church as an Instrument for Good—The more Nations in the Church the better	249—250
98.	Christianity has not divided Christians—Unity still dear to the Jews—Christian Cravings for Unity	250—252
99.	Hidden Purpose of the Crusades—Councils for the Reunion of Greeks and Latins—East and West after the Fall of Constantinople—The Uniate Church in Russia	252—255
100.	Projected Reunions in the West—Failures ever followed by Fresh Attempts—Grotius, Bossuet, Leibnitz as Peacemakers	255—258

CHRISTENDOM'S DIVISIONS.

§ 1. *Ecclesiastical History compared with other Histories.*

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY contains a good deal that is common to all other histories, but it has likewise some special features of its own, which other histories either exhibit in a less degree or not at all. It is just the difference that exists between the Bible and all other books, and prevents our ever attaining to the full meaning of the former by the ordinary rules in use for interpreting the latter. That human agents in all ages have not merely worked out their own ends, but, in so doing, have advanced a plan and purpose not their own, must be obvious to every dispassionate student of history.[1] That there are marks of design and Providence in the conduct of the affairs of men, in the rise and fall of empires, in the spread and progress of some races, in the extinction of others, in the uniform march of civilisation from east to west, in the particular events that have been productive of what is called

[1] Bossuet's *Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle*, says the *Saturday Review* (Aug. 27, 1864, p. 273), 'was the first great attempt ever made to view the whole course of history as a whole, traversed and sustained by one great design.' According to the same Review, they are 'the dealings of God with man, in fact, as displayed in universal history,' which form the subject of that splendid work. 'From our own reflections we learn that there is a God possessed of certain attributes, and ruling over the world. Though this Being has chosen to leave us free, He has secret ways of controlling and disposing our free-will in such a manner as to work out His designs. The history of the world must, and does, show specifically how He has directed human affairs, and what is their great general lesson.'

European civilisation; in the late discovery of the New World, and the extraordinary rapidity with which it is becoming super-peopled and super-civilised; can no more be doubted than the existence of final causes in the order of nature.[2] Each successive age has been engaged in working out results for its own ends, and according to its ability; but in process of time it has seemed as though each age had been but elaborating some part or parts of a preconceived plan, so harmoniously have they contributed to some general purpose, to which their own was related as one of its many preliminary stages—one age, as it were, extracting, and another roasting the raw ore; another smelting it; another refining it; another casting it into various shapes; which another subsequently burnished, and fitted for extensive use.

Yet the annals of mankind are likewise full of chasms and irregularities, night and day, deaths and births, risings and fallings, progress and relapse. Sometimes there is a general stagnation, sometimes all interest is concentrated upon a single nation. Sometimes two rival nations dispute preeminence. In the end both conquered and conqueror disappear from history, and new races take their place. Civilisation was kindled—who can say how?—in Africa and in Asia, while all was darkness in Europe. Then it waned in Asia, but was lit in Europe with such increased brilliancy, that even the clouds which had accumulated over Asia and Africa were illumined. It goes out in Europe—it glimmers but as a rushlight at Constantinople; still, before it has gone quite out, from that solitary rushlight the many lamps of modern Europe are rekindled, and burn again to the revelation of a new world.

So likewise has it fared—in its earthly relations at all events—with Ecclesiastical History. Religion has shifted about, changed places, thriven, faded, and thriven once more; commenced in a corner, and ended by expanding far and wide

[2] 'Nam quibus Ille, tum ad eam rem, tanquam Sibi destinatam, instrumentis utitur . . . his omnia, etiam quæ ab humanâ prudentiâ non pendent, fluunt supra votum magis quam fert solita casibus humanis varietas: quæ tanta eventuum similitudo, et ad certum finem quasi conspiratio, indicium est Providæ Directionis. . . .'—Grotius, *De Verit. Rel. Chr.* lib. i. c. 12.

no less than civilisation. The Jews have been cast off, and the Gentiles taken into covenant in their place. But, again, some countries are still pagan; and some countries have abjured that Christianity that was once their boast. Then there have been ages which produced martyrs, and ages which produced fathers and doctors; ages of conversions, ages of heresies, ages of corruptions, ages of revolutions, ages of revival and unprecedented activity. In all these vicissitudes the history of the people of God does not differ materially from that of nations generally; but it has this one marked feature, to which no parallel—unless in faintest outline—can be traced elsewhere; namely, that it presents the spectacle of one continuous and consistent whole, and can be examined exhaustively in no other way.

§ 2. *Historical Continuities.—Jewish and Church-history.*

Everybody must know what is meant when we say that a history is continuous. Its continuity belongs either to its subject-matter, or else to the relation in which it is viewed. The history of England is one thing; the history of France another. We cannot intermix them without confusing them; neither can we understand either of them properly unless we study both of them from their commencement. We cannot begin the history of England at the Reformation, the Restoration, or the Revolution, for this simple reason, that some of the most essential parts of its constitution date from a more remote age. On the other hand, as we begin from, or go back to, its earliest times, we note the causes one by one which have led to our present arrangements in Church and State, and observe how very gradually they have effected these results; and yet without them we feel that we should never have come to be what we are. Trial by jury, hereditary succession to the Crown, representative Parliaments, Magna Charta, the Premunire Statute, the Habeas Corpus Act—how little could the authors or promoters of them have foreseen what would grow out of them all; and yet, when we look back to them, we gratefully admit that we are

their legitimate offspring, and that the absence of any one of them might have stunted our growth.

Meanwhile we are limited by our subject-matter to the history of England. Its continuity would be disturbed if, in commencing it, we digressed into Roman; or, in going on with it, we digressed into French or Italian history. Nevertheless, a history of the civilisation of mankind might borrow its facts from all histories, ancient and modern, without at all infringing upon its continuity, provided only that those facts were subservient to its leading idea.[3] Thus we might compare many of our social and domestic usages with the laws of ancient Greece and Rome, and recognise more or less affinity in the spirit that dictated them; still, we could not say that there was any real continuity between modern civilisation and that of Greece and Rome; or, at all events, to the same degree that there is between England under Edward I. and England under Queen Victoria. Yet what is even this latter continuity in comparison with that which is no less indisputable between the dispensations of the Law and of the Gospel? It is as impossible to study the history of the second apart from the first, as to study the history of England from any point short of its earliest commencement. What account can we give of Christian baptism without going back to Circumcision; of the Holy Eucharist without going back to the Passover? For the origin of our moral code, for the Ten Commandments themselves, we are thrown back upon the books of Moses; and would we reply to the question, 'What think ye of Christ? whose Son is He?' we must be content to refer to the genealogies of the tribe of Judah. Is there any other history that has its commencement in Adam, and its unbroken issues in our own days? Elsewhere, too, the march of empire has been followed by the extinction or amalgamation of races, analogous to that of species amid the revolutions of nature. No nationality now claims to be lineally descended from the Romans under Augustus, or from the Greeks under Alex-

[3] On this see some excellent remarks by Mr. Dyer, Pref. to the *Hist. of Modern Europe*, p. vii. *et seq.*

ander, or from the Medes and Persians under Darius. Still less are there to be found any true representatives of the Germans under Arminius, of the Britons under Boadicea, or of the Gauls under Brennus. What we notice in our own days of Australian aborigines, or of the Red Indians of North America, has been the fate of all those who once inhabited our own island. And is it not in exact antithesis to all these, that a much older people than any of them—the first, in short, to have had a written history—should have survived for nearly nineteen centuries; cast off, trampled under foot, dispersed into all lands, still maintaining their nationality, still testifying to the religion that has in fact outgrown them, still yearning for the day that shall see them resettled in their own land as one people? Their world-wide dispersion, and their continuance, notwithstanding it, as a nation, is alike without precedent. And are not their annals, long previously to their dispersion, at least as unique? In some respects they lived and fared, to be sure, neither better nor worse than their neighbours; but in all that made up their distinctive character, surely their whole career has been altogether unexampled.[4] Their ceremonial, whether they knew it or not, was all confessedly typical of something beyond it; the promises upon which they leaned had a wider meaning for others than for themselves exclusively; their land of Canaan, their city of Zion, were but shadows that could not satisfy even their own cravings. Nor was this all. It is impossible to study the history of the Jews and that of the Church without being struck with the sustained character of the parallelism that exists between them.

§ 3. *Sustained Parallelism in the Annals of both Revelations. Providence and Free-will harmonised.*

Parallelism of some kind or other there must, of course, always be between ancient and modern characters and events.

[4] 'Truly it is not the tongue exclusively of those men, but their very life, that I affirm to have been a prophecy—I call the whole Hebrew republic a great Prophet, in that it prophesied of a great Personage.'—S. Aug., *Cont. Faust.* lib. xxii. 24.

In the fortunes of Athens, Carthage, and Rome, we are continually reminded of some similar occurrence in our own country, or in our own age: we know what is meant by a modern Pericles, a modern Alcibiades, a modern Catiline, a modern Cicero, a modern Julius or Augustus Cæsar. We flatter ourselves that we have inherited the spirit of the old Romans, and we are not loth to recognise very much resemblance between the genius of our polished neighbours and that of Athens in her palmiest days. Some of these parallels are singularly apposite, and may be very closely pushed: still they belong to no system; they are selected at random from the chronicles of the past; and if they do not approve themselves, we go elsewhere for our illustrations with the greatest ease. In no case do we expect our parallel to hold good beyond a certain point; nor, in the case of the best of them, can we assign any precise reason why they should have held good thus far. In the history of the Jews all is parallel. It is the history of one people foreshadowing in its successive stages the destinies of another people, and in a manner too consistent and too consecutive to be the effect of accident. It had a religion of which the Christian is the matured expression; it had a ceremonial on which has been engrafted another, its avowed spiritual antitype; it had a ministry, to which the Christian exhibits just the very points of contrast and correspondence to be expected from their respective systems. Its Bible—the Old Testament—is indispensable to the Christian Bible. We may exchange the study of Greek and Latin for that of living languages in our schools and colleges; we may abandon the classics themselves for modern authors and modern science; but to the Old Testament, whether in its ceremonial or its historical aspect, we are bound for ever as members of the Church of Christ. We are thrown back upon it alike for the claims of our Founder, and in justification of the system which Christians themselves are carrying out. It is our collection of precedents both for acting and thinking as we do—perhaps more so than we imagine. From the very nature of the case there can be no analogy between Christianity and any other sys-

tem than that of the Jews under the Law. There have been no other revelations, positive declarations of the will of God, but these two. There are no antecedent or à priori considerations for enabling man to decide what a revelation should be; what amount or what kind of truths it should disclose. He can take the facts of one as he finds them, and argue from earlier to later facts in it, when there has been but one revelation; when there have been more than one, he can advance a step further, and argue from the analogy of the first to the second. There have been more monarchies in the world than our own: when, therefore, we discuss constitutional forms as Englishmen, we can refer to the histories of France, Spain, Italy, Rome, Greece, for cases in point. When we discuss matters as Christians, as Churchmen, we have but the history of the Jews to refer to for any distinctive argument or illustration, and a close one indeed it is. Look at the mere career of the Jews as one people, and that of the Church as another; see how consistently, both the parallel and the contrast between them has been maintained throughout, exactly as in the case of their respective ceremonies. Compare the victories which assured Canaan to the Israelites with those which assured the Gentile world to the Church—here matter struggling against matter; there mind against mind. In either case there is profuse shedding of blood. In either case the people of God are victorious, and yet their enemies, though borne down, are by no means extirpated. Similar institutions originate in the same needs on both sides, and in the same order: first, Judges and Fathers; then Kings and Popes. The last with similar consequences in both cases—a fatal schism. Who can pronounce these coincidences, so marked and apposite, to have been undesigned? Is there not the same family likeness, the same analogy, between them that there is between Jewish ordinances and Christian sacraments; its sole distinction consisting in the kind of instrumentality which it implies on the part of man? For men observe or violate God's ordinances with their eyes open, knowing them to be His; they carry out His economy with their eyes shut, or in ignorance of what they are accom-

plishing; that is, while giving effect to their own designs, they are unconsciously fulfilling His likewise; so that from their isolated and successive actions there gradually results a well-ordered combination, a magnificently contrived effect or scheme. We are all of us free agents—so much is indisputable; but we are all of us shaped and acted upon by circumstances notwithstanding. Our lot is cast in the age in which we live. The veriest accident might have prevented our parents from coming together, or ourselves from ever seeing the light. We are creatures of our birth, parentage, nationality, bringing up, and other contingencies equally independent of our choice and beyond our control. Events are sometimes submitted to us for our participation, and sometimes we rule them; but far more frequently we have to accommodate ourselves to them, as having been ruled by others. Trivial occurrences are constantly the making or unmaking of our whole career; and how often it happens that our worthiest achievements are not appreciated till long after we are dead and gone. What is true of individuals is true of nations and epochs no less. Professor Creasy has bequeathed to us a most instructive book upon decisive battles: he might have written as felicitously upon decisive emigrations, and even marriages; upon decisive inventions or discoveries. All of them are brought about by natural causes—by men working out what was before them, as they felt inclined; but the times and seasons of them all were evolved at His bidding, who prearranged all the scenes of the great drama that had to be played out upon earth. In the history of His own people it would be strange if the actors appeared in secondary characters only, or if the parts and events in which they figured were not fraught with design, coherence, and significance above all others. Call them by what name you will—types, precedents, examples, illustrations—there is a series of events under the Old Dispensation which have their regular counterparts in Church history, so that one forms a kind of running commentary upon the other, elucidating both the causes which led to it and its results. Accordingly, the first thing which I observe of the schism

between East and West—the Greek and Latin Churches—is its close resemblance to the division of Israel and Judah into two kingdoms, both in its origin and in its effects. This at once invests it with a character and significance which ordinary events have not. God has put His own mark upon it emphatically, as well as man! He speaks to us in the parallel as in a parable.[5]

§ 4. *Israel and Judah under Kings.*

The Israelites, in asking for a king, had evidently that form of government in view which they saw around them, and appeared the best adapted both for the administration of justice and for self-defence.[6] The height of their aspirations was to live under a local monarchy. Their request was stigmatised by Jehovah as a breach of confidence in Him, but it was granted. It had been all along foreseen. Not only did their divine statute-book contain a set of express rules for the election and conduct of their monarch that was to be,[7] but prophecy had already designated Judah as the tribe[8] in which the royal line was to be perpetuated, down to the very birth of Him whose kingdom was to be foreshadowed in their own. They would have done better to have depended upon Jehovah exclusively; nevertheless He had foreseen and ratified their choice. He Himself appointed their first kings successively; He designated the tribe, the house,[9] in which the kingly office was to be made permanent. He inspired the race of prophets by whom its glories were apostrophised as those of the kingdom of Heaven in effigy. He emphati-

[5] I went over all this ground in a small work called the 'Counter-Theory,' published anonymously by me as many as twelve years back; it having come out in A.D. 1853. (See p. 62 *et seq.*) What follows, however, is not a bare repetition of it by any means; though I must still refer to that work for the general principle, on which far more was said there than would be in keeping with my present subject.

[6] 'That we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles.'—1 Sam. viii. 20.

[7] Deut. xvii. 14–20.

[8] Gen. xlix. 8–12.

[9] 2 Sam. vii. 16, 19.

cally declared that the breach between Israel and Judah, notwithstanding the human causes and instruments that had been engaged in forwarding it, was 'from Him.'[10] There were many other ways of punishing the great king of Judah for his sins; but the establishment of a rival kingdom irremediably divided the twelve tribes as long as it lasted: all which is a living commentary upon what has occurred in the Church.

§ 5. *Origin of Church-government.—Synods peculiar to the Church.—Centralisation in the Empire.*

The form of government that met its gaze—under which the first Christians themselves lived either as citizens or as subjects—was not that of a kingdom, but of a world-wide empire, the best representative of law and order on so grand a scale that had as yet been seen. It united nations the most dissimilar and most dissociated by more than mere force of arms; it assured protection of life and property to its citizens; it was a centre of unity for all. It reposed upon a finely-drawn scale of graduating magistracies, culminating in a supreme Head. His will alone was above law. So long as Christianity was persecuted, and the empire its persecutor, there could be but little sympathy between them; and with its hopes concentrated upon the unseen world, Christianity could have been in no need of any principle of cohesion over and above its faith. It entered upon a new phase when its struggles for existence ceased, and it was taken into favour by the empire. It could not well have remained what it had been, under its altered circumstances. It was not that any change was needed, or was thought of, in the recesses of the sanctuary. There nothing more was wanted but what had been provided from the first—deacons to collect alms and to minister, priests to offer the Christian sacrifice, bishops to ordain and preside over all. It was simply that its machinery for self-government required extension, now that all obstacles to its free progress had been removed, that its unity might not be impaired by its ubiquity. Hitherto its government

[10] 1 Kings xii. 15.

had been peculiar, and based upon its own model—a kind of confederation of local churches, all possessing the same organisation, the same discipline, the same doctrine; all meeting together, upon emergencies, in representative synods—the only type of collective action that had been inaugurated by the Apostles themselves.[11] Each synod was the supreme executive as well as legislative authority for all the local churches composing it; and though its actual jurisdiction went no farther, its decisions were communicated to, and received with deference by, all others, as proceeding from brethren of the same household of faith.[12] In all this they had nothing in common with the empire, nor the empire with them. In the empire were to be found no representative assemblies; in the Church no centralised authority. The empire perished notwithstanding its centralisation; the Church, whatever else she may have adopted, retained her synods, and still lives.

This is a great fact, and one which has utterly been overlooked by those who, with Cave, Spanheim, and others, assert that in the age upon which we are entering 'the external polity of the Church was conformed, as near as might be, to the mode that obtained in the civil state.'[13] Here there never was, and never could be, but marked contrast between the Church and the empire. Synods, as they were the earliest, so they have been the most universally received type of Church government in all ages; even the fact that they have undergone so many modifications only serving to bring out more prominently the unanimity with which they have been upheld on all sides, in the midst of so much discordancy respecting almost every other question connected with ecclesiastical polity. The Greek Church, glorying in its agreement with antiquity, will decide nothing of consequence without them

[11] Acts xv. 1–29; xxi. 18–25. 1 Cor. v. 3–5.

[12] 'Ad Concilii Nicæni usque tempora, causæ omnes ecclesiasticæ in concilio cujusque provinciæ definitæ fuerant: paucissimæque incurrerant lites, quas plurium provinciarum judicio sopiri necessum fuisset. Nicæni Patres solius meminere provincialis synodi, ubi et controversias omnes finiri sanxere....'—Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Discipl.*, part i. lib. i. c. 3, § 8.

[13] Cave's *Antient Church Government*, p. 30, ed. 1683.

still; in the Latin Church it has never ceased to be customary to appeal to them from the Pope; the Church of England which upholds, and the Church of Geneva which has abjured, episcopacy, have made them part and parcel of their respective ideals; in Russia it is the Holy Governing Synod by which its national Church affects to be ruled. More than this, they were ecclesiastical synods that introduced the principle of representative government to mediæval Europe [14]—that fairest and freest of all forms of earthly legislature, to which Englishmen, of all others, have for so many centuries lain under so many obligations.

So much, therefore, for what the Church originated and did not copy; for that part of her polity which, however much she may have modified, she never abandoned, even when she copied most; for that part of her polity which has lasted longest, and been as yet the least adversely criticised of any. It is another question whether synods were all that the Church needed in her enlarged sphere, or whether her unity would have been endangered had not the principle of centralisation been adopted into her executive. How should we have acted ourselves, had we lived in those days? With no precedent in past history to guide her, with the magnificent precedent of her all-powerful ally before her eyes—realising, in fact, the universal dominion to which, as far as consciences were concerned, she aspired in theory—there were some specious grounds, at all events, for deciding as she did. Nay, practically, she was already more than half way on the road to her decision.

§ 6. *Christianity first preached in Capitals. Rise of Metropolitans.*

For just as in our own days any person having some new invention to bring out, or discovery to proclaim, or opinions

[14] As far back as the age of Tertullian this was their distinctive character. He says of them: 'Aguntur præterea per Græcias illa certis in locis concilia, ex universis ecclesiis, per quæ et altiora quæque in commune tractantur, et *ipsa repræsentatio* totius nominis Christiani magnâ veneratione celebratur.' — *De Jejun. adv. Psych.*, c. 13.

to propagate, would betake themselves to Paris, London, or Vienna, or at all events to the capitals of their own country, so the Apostles, naturally enough, commenced preaching and founding churches, not in hamlets or highways, but in the metropoles or chief cities of the empire. First, Jerusalem,[15] then Antioch,[16] became the centre from which Christian missions issued. S. Paul addressed his epistles to the Christians of Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, Colosse or Laodicea, Thessalonica. S. John his apocalypse to the seven churches in the seven principal cities of Asia Minor. S. Mark made the closing scene of his preaching Alexandria; S. John, Ephesus; S. Peter and S. Paul, Rome. This is one fact; another is, that in the single instance where S. Paul has written to more churches than one, he has designated them by the name of the Roman province in which they existed, or 'churches of Galatia;' just as S. Peter has specified those for whom he intends the first of his epistles, as 'the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia—all of them Roman provinces. From these two facts together we may readily guess the course that things would very naturally take. While churches were few and isolated, confined to chief towns, or scattered up and down some remote province, there could have been very little definite intercommunion between them; but when from the capital, Christianity had taken possession of the towns and villages of the same province, or from towns and villages had made its way to the capital, every local church became a link of connection between its neighbours on each side of it, and its neighbours with others, till at length one chain was formed, embracing, in the first instance indeed, no more than the churches of a single province, but eventually the churches of the entire known world.

Thus brought into comparative proximity and easy relation with each other, their intercourse, which had been previously irregular and unsystematic, began to be regarded as all-important to the common weal, and to be conducted on fixed

[15] Acts ii. & viii. 4.

[16] Acts xiii. 1–3.

principles. The churches of a single province, desirous of communicating, would depute certain of their members, at the head of whom was always their bishop, to confer upon their mutual interests. As citizens of the empire, and as followers of the Apostles, they would be induced to make the capital their rendezvous, and constitute the bishop of the capital, when assembled in it, their president.[17] Gradually such meetings were appointed to be held regularly twice a year[18] under such presidency; and gradually, to distinguish him from his brother bishops, the prelate of the capital acquired the title of metropolitan. He had scarce assumed a new name before new powers were delegated to him likewise. The synod retained the power of making laws in its own hands, but entrusted him generally with their execution. In all this there was assuredly nothing that was extraordinary or unreasonable, and yet the clear result of it all was, that every Roman province became the scene of a veritable constitutional kingdom in miniature, styling itself the Church, with the bishop of each metropolis—the metropolitan—for its regularly acknowledged head.[19]

[17] Tertullian, *De Præscript. Hær.* c. 36: 'Percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsidentur: apud quas ipsæ authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem, et repræsentantes faciem uniuscujusque. Proxima est tibi Achaia, habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedoniâ, habes Philippos, habes Thessalonicenses. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiæ adjaces, habes Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est.' Hence De Marca, *De Concord. Sac. et Imp.* lib. i. c. 3: 'Ecclesias ad exemplum Romani Imperii ab Apostolis ita distributas fuisse, ut inter fratres, ejus episcopi prima sententia haberetur, cui metropolitanæ urbis episcopatus concreditus fuisset, absque ullo negotio probari potest . . .' So Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discipl.* part i. lib. i. c. 3, § 1. Beveridge, *In Can. Apost.* xxxiv. (*Pandect.* vol. ii. *Annot.* p. 26.)

[18] *Can. Apost.* xxx.

[19] *Can. Apost.* xxvii. As yet the name had not come into use, though it is the power of metropolitans clearly which is here treated of, and this is the canon appealed to by the Synod of Antioch (A.D. 341) in the words 'according to the ancient canon which was in force in the age of our fathers.' See Beveridge on *Can. Concil. Antioch.* ix. (*Pandect.* vol. ii. *Annot.* p. 190.)

§ 7. *Origin of Patriarchs.*

And as the circle extended, it was the same principle that obtained, though on a larger scale. The provinces of the empire were subordinate, as were their magistrates, to its dioceses and vicars, and these dioceses and vicars themselves to its prefectures and prefects, 'the more immediate representatives of the imperial majesty,' as Gibbon says.[20] Here again the Church copied from the empire, but by no means with that minute servility which has been sometimes insinuated. The number of dioceses and vicars, or exarchs as they are called occasionally, was thirteen; but when or where do we read of as many ecclesiastical exarchates?[21] The number of prefectures, including that of Rome, was originally five; but the number of patriarchates was originally no more than three; and of the two that were added subsequently—not however till the civil prefectures had become six—Jerusalem had never been the metropolis of any civil prefecture. Still, in principle, these gradations were adopted by degrees into the Church. There were bishops of certain sees who became to the metropolitans of a number of provinces what each of these metropolitans had long been to the churches of his own province. It would appear from the language of the sixth Nicene canon, that up to that time there had been but three sees[22] so distinguished,[23] but it is implied likewise that

[20] *Decline and Fall*, c. xvii. § 2.

[21] The term 'exarch' never, in fact, became common in reference to church dignitaries. Hence some have considered it a mere synonyme for 'patriarch,' which it was not. See Can. ix. Concil. Chalced.

[22] See Gieseler, *E. H.* per. i. div. iii. § 68; Davidson's *Trans.*

[23] De Marca, *De Concord. Sac. et Imp.* lib. i. c. iii. § 7. Beveridge, Cave, Thomassin, and others, who contend that no more than metropolitan rights are here meant, forget that these had been already laid down, *Can. Apost.* xxvii. (see above), though the word 'metropolitan' had not then come into use. Just so here: patriarchal rights are intended, though the word was as yet unknown. What those rights were, we may learn from Beveridge, who has classed them under four heads:—

'1. Ut unusquisque ex iis habeat diœcesim. (He should have perhaps rather said 'præfecturam.')

2. 'Ut omnes diœcesis suæ metropolitanos ordinet.

'3. Ut eosdem ad synodos convocet.

'4. Ut in omnibus ecclesiasticis re-

'ancient custom' had assigned them that order and those prerogatives which are there confirmed. Each of these sees boasted of its Apostolic origin: still, in the mind of the Nicene Fathers, there can be but little question but that Rome ranked first, Alexandria second, and Antioch third,[24] and this was again, in point of fact, the civil precedence which attached to those cities.

Thus the second stage towards monarchy had been actually attained before the conversion of Constantine; and both of them through the medium of the episcopate. In the concerns of the sanctuary still, as formerly, one bishop was as good as another: as governors of the Church, a principle of subordination was being carried out among them deliberately, that could but end one way; and the whole Church was a consenting party to it—all which had been foreseen and arranged for by the same Providence that had approved of a king for Israel.

§ 8. *Power of Emperors over the Church.*

At first, it certainly seemed as though the supreme governorship of the Church had been entrusted to the converted emperors. Constantine assumed it, immediately after his victory over Maxentius, as a trust committed to him.[25] The First Council of Arles, which, Sirmondus says, was inferior only to a general council, and was attended by three British bishops, met A. D. 314, at his summons, to decide the ques-

bus, quæ magni sunt momenti, *ultimum judicium ferat*, si ad eum appelletur.' (Ibid. *Annot.* p. 53.)

It was but one step from this to the Popedom, i. e. a power having the same jurisdiction over patriarchs that patriarchs had over metropolitans. It should be observed the word 'metropolis' has three different senses, as being used to denote the chief town of (1) a province, (2) a diocese, (3) a prefecture. Again, the word 'diocese' had a much wider sense anciently than it has now.

[24] See the discussion that took place on the 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451); also, Canons 2 and 36 of the Trullan Council of A.D. 683 — unexceptionable evidence certainly, as far as Rome is concerned —with the ancient notitia printed by Beveridge, *Annot.* p. 135.

[25] See his own sentiments thereon, Euseb. *Vit. Const.* ii. 64–68.

tion between Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage, and the Donatists. He had previously referred it to Melchiades, bishop of Rome, and three other bishops of his own selection, but their sentence had been impugned. He had written to Melchiades, 'You must be well aware that such is my veneration for the Holy Catholic Church, that I would have you leave neither schism nor division of any kind any where.'[26] In summoning Chrestus, bishop of Syracuse, to the Synod of Arles, he says, 'It is incumbent on me to provide that what ought to have been stayed by voluntary agreement, after the decision which has just been given, should now by the presence of many be finally settled.'[27] On tidings of the rupture between Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, and Arius reaching him, he despatched a joint letter to them both, in which one is censured for having raised imprudent questions, and the other for having returned rash answers.[28] Unable to bring them to terms by his remonstrances, it was he who conceived and carried out the plan of calling all the bishops of Christendom together to pronounce upon their case.[29] Here is a fact of prime importance in ecclesiastical history, comparatively unnoticed. It should be written down in the largest characters, that what are called œcumenical councils *originated*, not with the Apostles or their successors, but with the first Christian emperor and his successors; so much so that there is not one of them, at least of those designated 'œcumenical' by East and West, that was not convened by imperial mandate.[30] There are some features in their constitution,

[26] Euseb. *F. H.* x. c. 5, § 6.

[27] Ibid. § 7. The whole story is very circumstantially told by St. Augustine, Ep. xliii. (Ed. Ben.) § 5, who defends Melchiades against the charge of usurping cognisance of a cause already adjudicated by seventy bishops of Africa, with their metropolitan at their head, on the ground that it had been referred to him, and the bishops selected to be his assessors, by the Emperor.

[28] Euseb. *Vit. Const.* ii. 69.

[29] Ibid. lib. iii. 6. Ὥσπερ ἐπιστρατεύων αὐτῷ Θεοῦ φάλαγγα, σύνοδον οἰκουμενικὴν συνεκρότει· σπεύδειν ἅπαντα χόθεν τοὺς ἐπισκόπους γράμμασι τιμητικοῖς προκαλούμενος. Socrates, *E. H.* i. 8, expresses all this much more literally.

[30] Cedren. ap. Suicer. in *Symb. Nic.* p. 3. Ἐκλήθησαν δὲ οἰκουμενικαὶ, διοτὶ ἐκ κελεύσεων βασιλικῶν οἱ κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Ῥωμαίων πολιτείαν ἀρχιερεῖς μετεκλήθησαν.

likewise, that deserve to be pointed out: first, the representative principle was restricted in them, on the clerical side, to the episcopate; on the lay side to the emperor or his delegates —in other words, to the heads of church and state. For what were bishops but the highest spiritual authority in their respective sees? and what were emperors but the supreme civil authority, to which even bishops themselves were subject? This was a new species of representation on either side, to say the least, and associated clergy and laity together upon widely different terms from what had hitherto prevailed. The rule professed by the emperors, indeed, was 'Quotiens de religione agitur, episcopos convenit judicare;'[31] but the acts of the 4th General Council[32] exhibit a true picture of its practical workings, even under the most favourable circumstances.

Another notable feature in their constitution was, that they directly involved the notion of universal monarchy. Who could have called the bishops of Christendom together unless one to whom they all owed allegiance? And when they were met together, was it not necessary that some one bishop should sit and act as president, and subscribe first? Already provincial bishops had accorded precedence to their metropolitans, and metropolitans themselves, as shown above, to the three sees of Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome. The only ques-

[31] *Cod. Theodos.* lib. xvi. tit. 11.

[32] The seven judges and eleven senators, who represented the emperor, sat in the centre of the church, immediately before the chancel, the bishops being ranged on the right and left. In the fifth action they are requested to preside over a special episcopal committee respecting doctrine. In the sixth action Marcian (and with him Pulcheria) appears in person to confirm the acts of the Council. Reference had been made to him continually during its progress. And, in conclusion, he conferred the privileges of a metropolitan see upon Chalcedon —the city in which it had met—with a salvo to the rights of the metropolitan of Nicomedia.—See Mansi, *Concil.* tom. vii. It was of such councils (he is more particularly referring to the second of them) that S. Gregory Nazianzen said, Ἔχω μὲν οὕτως, εἰ δεῖ τἀληθὲς γράφειν, ὥστε πάντα σύλλογον φεύγειν ἐπισκόπων, ὅτι μηδεμιᾶς συνόδου τέλος εἶδον χρῆστον, μηδὲ λύσιν κακῶν, μᾶλλον ἐσχηκυίαν ἢ προσθήκην. Ἀεὶ γὰρ φιλονεικίαι καὶ φιλαρχίαι, κ.τ.λ.—*Ep. ad Procop.* (Prefect of Constantinople) (130 ed. Caillau) written early in A.D. 382.

tion that remained, therefore, was which of these three, when the Church met in œcumenical synod, should preside and occupy the first place? Each might, of course, have done so by rotation, or the presidency might have been made elective, but in point of fact it was decided otherwise. For whether emperors presided, or appointed presidents in some sense over every general council convened by them or not, it is quite certain that the bishop of Rome, or his vicegerents, occupied the first place amongst bishops[33] when present,[34] and had the honour of subscribing first to its decrees. Gradually, then, as the whole Church assembled in œcumenical synod, it not only felt conscious of having been convened by one sovereign potentate, but it likewise saw the bishop of one see sitting at the head of its collective episcopate. Could it have been otherwise than a mere question of time to delegate to him the same executive powers over Christendom generally that had been already delegated to metropolitans over provincial, and to patriarchs over diocesan churches?[35] Could it have been otherwise regarded than as a carrying out of received principles to their legitimate results; a logical consequence of assimilating ecclesiastical jurisdiction to that of the empire, the universal Church to the universal state? Let us suppose that the emperors, instead of originating œcumenical councils, had interdicted every other larger assembly in

[33] 'Hosius of Cordova, if, as some accounts state, he presided, did so as the favourite of the emperor: if it may be so expressed, the Court divine.' —*Latin Christianity*, b. i. c. ii. p. 60.

[34] Which they were not at that of Constantinople.

[35] Ranke is consequently more just than Cave, when he says: 'It was imperative on the ecclesiastical body to form their constitution on the model of that of the empire: and accordingly the hierarchy of the bishops, metropolitan and patriarchs, was formed in close correspondence with the gradations of the civil power. No long time had elapsed before the bishops of Rome acquired the supremacy. . . .' Then, after pointing out its Apostolic origin as a see, and its civil pre-eminence as a city, as having contributed to this result, he proceeds, 'In addition to all this, the emperors now found it advisable to favour the advancement of a great patriarchal authority. . . . Had there been but one emperor, a universal primacy might also have established itself, but this was prevented by the partition of the empire.'—*Lives of the Popes*, vol. i. pp. 7, 8, Forster's *Trans.*

Christendom than that of presbyters under their own bishop, and we shall not fail to perceive that all those 'ancient customs' to which the sixth Nicene canon alludes would have been overridden. Councils had been becoming more and more general for some time past, when through the instrumentality of Constantine they reached their climax.

In the matter of appeals, likewise, there can be no doubt but that Constantine and his successors received them from all parts of Christendom, and appointed judges to hear them, whose sentence they confirmed and executed. Previously there had been no one supreme court of appeal in the Church; now there was not only one, but it vested in one supreme potentate. There is not a heresy from that of Paul of Samosata, nor a schism from that of Donatus, of any consequence for the first six centuries, in which their intervention is not recorded in some form or other. The very first sentence of death for heterodoxy ever executed was decreed by Maximus, in A.D. 385, against Priscillian. The earliest ecclesiastical historian had styled Constantine 'a common bishop;'[36] the next in order, far from disputing it, expresses himself as follows, in a studied preface:—'We include the emperors in our history, because from the time that they became Christian, ecclesiastical affairs have depended on them, and the greatest councils have been and are held by their decree.'[37] Any one who will be at the pains of examining the sixteenth book of the Theodosian Code, the novels of Justinian, the letters that passed between emperors and councils, emperors and bishops, emperors and heretics and schismatics, emperors and their officers upon matters ecclesiastical, will see to what extent they then legislated on behalf of the Church. It is not less true that their power over the collective Church at length wholly ceased. Indeed, almost from the first, their acts were calculated to excite misgivings in the minds of most, and to kindle instinctive yearnings for some ultimate appeal of a

[36] *Vit. Const.* i. 44. So Constantine elsewhere (ibid. iv. 24) styles himself 'a bishop in the things that are without the Church.'

[37] Pref. to *E. H.* lib. v.

more congenial nature. Constantine deposed and banished S. Athanasius and his adherents, as well as Arius. Under his son Constantius[38] assembled that notoriously packed synod, of which S. Jerome was describing the issue when he wrote, 'Ingemuit totus orbis, et Arianum se esse miratus est.'[39] To Theodosius II., in the next century, belongs the credit of another synod, to which the disreputable name of 'Latrocinium' has ever since been applied. And when Zeno published his Hénoticon in A.D. 482, it was evident that he assumed the power of legislating in matters of faith, and of overruling what had been settled in full œcumenical council.

§ 9. *Early Prerogatives of Rome.—Founded by the two greatest Apostles.—Were its Rights based on Divine Law?*

There were very early symptoms of the recoil which ensued, and there were still earlier indications of the authority by which that of the emperors was to be superseded. The emperors themselves in fact cooperated to their own displacement. First, in the very hearing of Constantine, and in his own stronghold—the East—the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, passed a series of canons against appealing to the emperor from the judgment of synods and metropolitans.[40] Six years afterwards, the West, represented by the Council of Sardica, passed three canons in favour of appealing to the see of Rome, and enacted that no bishop, so appealing, should have a successor appointed over his head, till his cause had been heard there.[41] Socrates, himself a Greek, attests the existence of

[38] His reply to the Western bishops was quite enough to inspire just misgivings. Ὅπερ ἐγὼ βούλομαι, τοῦτο κανὼν, ἔλεγε, νομιζέσθω· οὕτω γάρ μου λέγοντος δυέχονται οἱ τῆς Σύριας λεγόμενοι ἐπίσκοποι.—S. Athan. *Hist. Arian. ad Monach.* § 33. The power of the emperors was never loved in the West, but as yet the West was in its infancy compared with the East.—*V.* Gieseler, *E. H.* per. ii. div. 1, § 94.

[39] Adv. *Lucif.* p. 300, Ed. Bened.

[40] Can. 11, 12, 14, 15, 20. Singularly enough these canons were directed against S. Athanasius, whom Constantine, the brother of Constantius, had recalled from exile.

[41] Can. 4. The set-off to these canons on the part of the East is to be found in Concil. Constant. Can. 6 (Canon 5 had directly alluded to the Sardican decrees), and Concil. Chalced. Canon 9, both, however, equally against appeals to the civil power. The theory that the Sardican canons conferred a more personal privilege

some still earlier canon than this, when he says of the Council of Antioch, just mentioned, that there was an ecclesiastical canon declaring it unlawful for local churches to make any canons of their own against the will of the bishop of Rome,[42] which it had set aside. Eusebius, himself a semi-Arian, and bishop of Constantinople, exhorts Julius, bishop of Rome, to become judge in the matter of S. Athanasius, and to summon the cause thither for his cognisance.[43] That the see of Rome was supposed to possess some inherent prerogatives, from the earliest age downwards, no student of ecclesiastical history will now deny; and the most hostile explanation that can be given of them is, that they attached to it as the seat of empire. This may or may not be the fair inference to be drawn from those well-known canons of the 2nd[44] and 4th[45] General Councils, in which rank 'next after Rome' is given to the see of Constantinople; but it is certainly fair to call attention to what they suppress, as well as express. Constantinople had,

upon Julius, is as sound as that which interprets S. Matt. xvi. 18, of a personal privilege conferred upon S. Peter. As well might it be said that Romans xii. was a collection of precepts binding only on the 'brethren' at Rome of that date.

[42] *E. H.* ii. 8. Κελεύοντος μὴ δεῖν παρὰ τὴν γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης τὰς ἐκκλησίας κανονίζειν.

[43] Ibid. ii. 11. Αὐτὸν κριτὴν τῶν κατὰ Ἀθανάσιον γενέσθαι παρακαλῶν, καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν καλεῖν τὴν δίκην. What partisan of Rome could have used stronger language in those days? Does it not fully bear out what Julius himself says, in a letter which, by inserting it as he has, S. Athanasius must likewise be understood to endorse, Ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε, ὅτι τοῦτο ἔθος ἦν, πρότερον γράφεσθαι ἡμῖν, καὶ οὕτως ἔνθεν ὁρίζεσθαι τὰ δίκαια . . . These then are the words of a bishop of Rome to a bishop of Constantinople, among others (who had already encouraged the idea himself) reported approvingly by the greatest of all bishops of Alexandria, then the second see in Christendom. A delicious notice of S. Athanasius and his case, by Ammianus Marcellinus, speaks volumes for the current opinions of those days: 'Athanasium episcopum eo tempore apud Alexandriam . . . cœtus in unum quæsitus ejusdem loci multorum (synodus, ut appellant) removit a sacramento, quod obtinebat . . . (i. e. his see). Hunc per subscriptionem, *abjicere sede sacerdotali*, paria sentiens cæteris, jubente Principe, Liberius monitus, perseveranter renitebatur: nec visum hominem, nec auditum, damnare, nefas ultimum sæpe exclamans, aperte scilicet recalcitrans imperatoris arbitrio. Id enim ille, Athanasio semper infestus, licet sciret impletum, tamen auctoritate quoque, *quâ potiores æternæ Urbis episcopi*, firmari desiderio nitebatur ardenti . . . .'—Lib. xv. c. 7.

[44] Can. 3.

[45] Can. 28.

in fact, no other title to put forward but that of its imperial importance. Rome, on the other hand, in addition to any mere imperial privileges, had another that had infinitely more charms for Christendom, namely, the preeminence of its apostolic origin. As it was the only see in the West which could boast of that distinction, so it was the only see in all the world that had been founded, not by one Apostle, but by two, and those two the greatest of all the Apostles. This—incomparably more than the other—is the fact so glowingly dwelt upon by SS. Irenæus,[46] Cyprian,[47] Tertullian,[48] SS. Athanasius,[49] Augustine,[50] and others, who have testified to the prerogatives of the see of Rome; and if they have nowhere defined these prerogatives, it is quite certain that both fathers and councils continually acted as recognising in them a good deal more than mere words. It was likewise in deference to the memory of S. Peter that the Sardican Fathers encouraged appeals to that see:[51] it was to the faith given to the Romans by S. Peter, and professed by their pontiff Damasus, and by Peter, bishop of Alexandria, that Theodosius appealed in his celebrated law of A.D. 380, a year, that is, before the council of Constantinople had met.[52] And in A.D. 445, Valentinian III. summed up all

[46] *Adv. Hær.* iii. 3. 'Gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo fundatæ et constitutæ ecclesiæ . . . ad hanc enim ecclesiam, propter potiorem principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in quâ semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ab Apostolis traditio.'

[47] *Ep.* 55 (Ed. Ben.). 'Ad Petri cathedram, atque ad ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est.' (p. 56.)

[48] *De Præs. Hær.* c. 36. 'Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas est præsto. Ista quam felix ecclesia, cui totam doctrinam Apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt.'

[49] *Hist. Arian. ad Mon.* § 35 (Ed. Ben.). Οὐκ ὅτι Ἀποστολικός ἐστι θρόνος ᾐδέσθησαν, οὔθ' ὅτι μητρόπολις ἡ Ῥώμη τῆς Ῥωμανίας ἐστιν.'

[50] In quâ semper Apostolicæ cathedræ viguit principatus.'—*Ep.* 43, § 7 (Ed. Ben.) Comp. the list of titles quoted from St. Francis of Sales, as attributed by the Fathers to the see of Rome, by De Maistre, *Du Pape*, lib. i. c. 6.

[51] Can. 3. If it be asked whether Rome was so distinguished in sole virtue of her apostolic origin, it cannot be denied that other churches, apostolic likewise in their origin, but not of equal rank as cities, never came to be so honoured. However, this would not *prove* that Rome would never have been so honoured had *she* been but a second-rate city.

[52] *Cod. Theodos.* tit. 1, lib. xvi.

that had been done by his predecessors for 'the apostolic chair,' in language that could never have been ventured on, had it not been backed by public opinion.[53] As is usual in such cases, there never ceased to be some that opposed its prerogatives, either when pressed against themselves, or when first attempted to be sharply defined. Eastern bishops were prone to depreciate, and Western to magnify, them. As a general rule, they could not fail to produce, when acted upon extensively, the same amount of controversy that metropolitans, from time to time, encountered from their suffragans in the province, and patriarchs in the diocese. But the rights of patriarchs and of metropolitans were completely the result of ecclesiastical ordinances, every one of them liable to be repealed or modified at any time, and not based upon any divine law at all.[54] Was it so with the prerogatives of the see of Rome? There are two facts which are of prime significancy in connection with them.

§ 10. *Characteristics of the See of Rome.—Seat of Empire removed from Rome.*

First, its bishops from the very earliest age always imagined themselves possessed of some peculiar rights of their own, and never would take their place upon terms of equality with any other bishops. 1. They never would attend in person any one of the general councils convened by the emperors at a

Three principal sees had been named by the Nicene Fathers—only two here—which shows the process of elimination that was going on. Only Rome is mentioned in those canons which place Constantinople next in rank after Rome.

[53] *Novell. Theodos.* tit. xxiv. 'We ordain by a perpetual sanction that nothing shall be attempted by the bishops of Gaul, or by the other provinces, against ancient custom, without the authority of the venerable Pope of the eternal city: but that to them, and to all, whatever the authority of the apostolic chair has or shall have ordained, shall be law: so that if any bishop, when summoned, should have neglected to come to the judgment-seat of the Roman prelate, he should be compelled to present himself there by the governor of the province; the privileges which our forefathers of happy memory have accorded to the Roman see being preserved inviolate.' Valentinian ruled, of course, only over the West.

[54] Leo Allat. *De Eccl. Oc. et Or. Perp. Cons.* lib. i. c. 8, § 1. 'Cum patriarchæ et primates nullam divino jure certam et constantem jurisdictionem habeant, sed eam varient pro temporum et occasionum diversitate,' &c.

distance from Rome.[55] 2. There were plainly other churches besides Rome—and some of them more ancient than Rome—of apostolic origin; still, no Roman bishop ever spoke of Rome but as the apostolic chair, or see, '*par excellence.*' 3. Other prelates called themselves metropolitans, archbishops, or patriarchs, as soon as ever those titles had been accorded to them by the canons; the bishop of Rome never once styled himself metropolitan, archbishop, or patriarch,[56] or let others do so uncorrected; successor, or vicar, of S. Peter, pope, pontiff, or apostolic prelate, were the titles which, though no one canon had ever assigned to him, he gradually assumed, as if by inheritance, and impressed upon the Christian world as his own; nor, certainly, was it by force of arms that he brought about their recognition. Whatever one may think of the validity of his claims in themselves, it is quite certain that they never could have prevailed over the whole Christian world, to the extent they did, had they not been allowed.

Secondly, it was precisely as it ceased to be the metropolis of the empire, that Rome came to be the metropolis of Christendom; and, in proportion as the power of the emperors over the Church waned, that its own spiritual powers increased. This, certainly, does not look as if its ecclesiastical prerogatives had grown out of, or depended upon, its civil preeminence; rather, it would appear, that the emperors themselves had been determined, by some hidden influence or other, to make way for the popes. Constantine declared that he was acting in obedience to a command from heaven in founding Constantinople.[57] He could have scarcely ventured to break with the traditions of more than 1000 years upon lighter grounds. Peter the Great was not

[55] This was the real reason why Vigilius, though present at the time in Constantinople, would not attend the 5th General Council assembled (A.D. 553) there. There was no precedent for it.

[56] 'Observandum est,' says Beveridge very frankly, 'Romanum episcopum se nunquam patriarcham appellasse, etiamsi ab aliis ita appelletur: *reliqui autem quatuor, non tantum ab aliis ita vocantur, sed et se patriarchas sæpe vocant . . . .*'—*Pandect.* vol. ii. Annot. p. 53.

[57] 'Jubente Deo,' quoted by Gibbon in a note, cxvii. Comp. Sozom. *E. H.* ii. 3.

changing the seat of empire (for what empire had Russia known previous to his?) when he founded S. Petersburg. Napoleon I. in the plenitude of his power, would have shrunk from attempting to impose a new capital upon France, instead of Paris. Constantine alleged motives which the public opinion of those days accepted; and so effectually did he carry his point, that though the empire was afterwards divided into east and west, Rome never again became the capital of his western successors.

§ 11. *Rival to Rome in Constantinople. — Questions affecting the Papacy.*

But then, if he left Rome free for the popes,[58] he, by the same act, enabled the bishops of Constantinople to become their rivals. Here is another fact that wants bringing out. There was not one bishop capable of making head against Rome before Constantinople was founded; and had Constantine and his successors never left Rome, its bishop, though he might have been now and then overborne by the emperors themselves, would certainly never have met with any opposition to his prerogatives amongst bishops, and Christendom might have remained for ages under his spiritual headship.[59]

What account is to be given of this phenomenon, in appearance so self-conflicting? If it was a special providence that gave Rome to the popes, it was a special providence no less (for it formed part of the same transaction) that gave them a rival in the Constantinopolitan patriarch,

[58] 'The foundation of Constantinople marks one of the great periods of change in the annals of the world . . . The absence of a secular competitor allowed the papal authority to grow up and develope its secret strength,' &c.—*Latin Christianity*, b. iii. c. 3, p. 400.

[59] See Ranke before quoted, and Dean Milman, *Lat. Christian.* b. i. c. 2, p. 58. 'The removal of the seat of empire to Constantinople consummated the separation of Greek and Latin Christianity; one took the dominion of the East, the other of the West,' &c. This, however, is overstated; East and West constituted but one Church for more than six centuries after 'the removal of the seat of empire.'

and ranged east and west under two spiritual heads.[60] Or, again, what account is to be given of these ecclesiastical prerogatives which the bishops of Rome claimed gradually; and neither orthodox nor heretics really disputed, except in their exercise? If they were based on divine right, why were they dormant so long, and only gradually brought out? What other ordinance of the gospel is there that did not come into force at once, as soon as instituted? Baptism and the breaking of bread commenced on the very day of Pentecost. Deacons, priests, and bishops assuredly did not enter upon some of their respective functions in the first, and others in the third or fourth century; nor were there any essential articles of the law, or the doctrine of Christ, from which the first converts were dispensed. If the primacy

[60] That is, *after* the schism. It is certain that till then Constantinople never claimed to be more than 'next after Rome;' in the words of her own special synod (Concil. Constant. i. Can. 2), and that the primacy which Rome *then* exercised over her, was more than nominal. See particularly the acts of the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 869, by the Latins and part of the Greek Church called 'the eighth' general, which are fairly commented upon by Gieseler, *E. H.* per. iii. div. ii. § 41, note 15, and on which great light is thrown by the two following statements of contemporaries.

1. Glaber Radulphus, *Hist.* iv. 1:— 'Circa annum D. MXXIV. Constantinopolitanus Præsul cum suo Principe Basilio, aliique nonnulli Græcorum consilium iniere, quatenus *cum consensu* Romani Pontificis liceret ecclesiam Constantinopolitanam in suo orbe, *sicuti Roma in universo*, universalem dici et haberi,' &c. The whole passage, as well as the letter from Willelm to John XIX. (the then pope) which follows, should be carefully studied. Why should the pope have been thus approached with bribes, had he no power at all then over the Church of Constantinople?

2. The other passage was penned at Constantinople itself by one who was then there as ambassador:— 'Scimus, *immo videmus*, Constantinopolitanum episcopum pallio non uti, nisi *Sancti Patris nostri permissu*. Verum cum impiissimus Albericus, quem non stillatim cupiditas, sed velut torrens impleverat, Romanam civitatem sibi usurparet, dominumque Apostolicum quasi servum proprium in conclavi teneret, Romanus (i. e. *the Greek*) Imperator filium suum Theophylactum eunuchum Patriarcham constituit: cùmque eum Alberici cupiditas non lateret, missis ei muneribus satis magnis, effecit ut ex Papæ nomine Theophylacto Patriarchæ litteræ mitterentur, quarum auctoritate cùm ipse, tum successores ejus, absque Paparum permissu, palliis uterentur. Ex quo turpi commercio vituperandus mos inolevit, ut non solùm Patriarchæ, sed etiam episcopi totius Græciæ, palliis utantur . . . . This was in A. D. 971.—Luitprand, *Legat. C. P.* § 62; ap. Migne, *Patrol. C. C.* vol. CXXXVI. p. 934.

of the see of Rome was a fundamental part of the polity of the Church, why were the rights of metropolitans and patriarchs defined first, and when the Church was one, while those of the papacy remained in suspense till there was a rival in readiness to contest them? Above all, how has it happened that the unity of the Church was never impaired, while its destinies were under the control of the emperors, but rent almost immediately, from the time that they began to be more exclusively controlled by the popes? Obviously enough, it is not every theory of development that will reconcile these contradictions. On the other hand, he that would ascribe the origin of the preeminence of the see of Rome to the decrees of councils, or the laws of emperors, is simply closing his eyes to that part of history which precedes them; and he that will see nothing but the hand of man in its undying sway, must acknowledge that history contains no other instance of a sovereignty so powerless in arms, yet so unfaltering in its moral claims; so circumscribed in territory, yet so absolutely irrepressible in its dominion over religious thought and conscience all over the world.

§ 12. *Theocracy and Christocracy.—Ideal Polity.*

As it appears to me, if we would but calmly examine these ecclesiastical phenomena by the light which Jewish history supplies, we shall neither contravene principles, nor outrun facts, nor be forced into any deductions but what are strictly consistent with both. The whole case may be stated in a very few words. If the constitution which God originally intended for Israel was a Theocracy, we may argue from analogy that the constitution which God intended originally for Christendom was a Christocracy. Faith in the invisible would thus have been the polar-star of both systems: the first, a local monarchy, consisting of the members of a single family, under the God of their fathers, governed according to that code which we call 'the Law:' the second, a world-wide empire, consisting of all the families of earth, under

their common Saviour, governed according to that code which we call 'the Gospel.'

Practically speaking, of course, both these governments must have had their earthly side as well as their heavenly; they could never have subsisted without magistrates of some kind or other, and by them would their respective codes have been administered, and the details of order and discipline carried out. So far, therefore, as appearances went, one might have been scarce distinguishable from the republic of Athens, and the other from the great republic of modern days, the United States.

But they would have differed from these, and from all others, so fundamentally in one respect, that any comparisons between them and any other form of government that has ever existed upon earth, would only have the effect of obscuring their real nature; for where is the state, modern or ancient, pagan or Christian, that has not reposed its supreme authority, its final appeal, in man (be he one or many), with all his mixed motives, with all his acquired prejudices, with all his innate imperfections? Let the supreme tribunal, so constituted, be supposed ever so incorruptible, as long as it is of man, we must always know the arguments by which it will be approached and influenced. It cannot, if it strove ever so, reach forward into futurity, or decipher hearts. Inferior judges themselves, in giving their decisions, may feel comparatively secure, when the appeal lies merely to their fellow-men; and how much is it not thought to import when ecclesiastical causes are brought for final settlement before the civil power, or the reverse? But take away the idea of any sovereign power upon earth at all: impress magistrates habitually, that they are all of them fallible, and never can be but subordinates; that the final appeal from them, in each case, lies not to one or more of their fellow-men, but to One to whom all hearts are open, and from whom no secrets are hid. Refer to God collectively, and in behalf of the whole nation, all those questions which every good Christian is individually in the habit of referring to Him for his own well-being and conduct through life, and

surely one cannot but see that justice would be very differently administered, and the work of legislation very differently carried on in a state whose fundamental idea was this—that every matter of supreme moment, whether to individuals or to the body politic, should be carried before God, in that language and with those feelings that we creatures are accustomed to embody when we approach Him, and designate by the name of prayer. It may be, it is doubtless, the custom of some supreme potentates to pray for guidance before coming to their decisions; but which of them, on the whole, can have the least doubt of his own competency, or be without the consciousness of his own importance? How different is the idea when we picture to ourselves a state where, though there may be many subordinates, there is no sovereign power at all acknowledged, either in theory or practice, but God or Christ alone; where nothing is ever finally settled by any one man, or body of men, claiming to be supreme; and where, though some inequalities of rank may exist, there are no inequalities authorised between persons of the same rank. Such would appear to have been the ideal (*πολιτεία κατ' εὐχήν*[61]) intended both for the twelve tribes and for the Christian world.

§ 13. *Arguments for the actual Form.—Practical View of the Case.*

What has been allowed and sanctioned has been allowed and sanctioned from condescension to human exigencies and infirmities (*κατὰ τὸν δεύτερόν φασι πλοῦν*)[62] in either case; though we are not therefore bound to regard the realisation of the ideal upon earth as a moral impossibility. There seems no reason at all to conclude, for instance, that the world might not have been Christianised and yet Christendom have remained as essentially detached, in organisation as well as in spirit, from the world as it certainly was in its three first centuries. It might, perhaps, have thus never known metropolitans, patriarchs, or pope, but it would likewise have never

[61] Arist. *Pol.* ii. 1. [62] Arist. *Eth.* ii. 9.

known kings and emperors. It might have remained a mere aggregate of local churches in communion with each other, but it would never have taken the shape of national churches —churches interwoven with states, and independent of each other. As emergencies arose, their invisible Head would have raised up champions equal to deal with them, in all ages, as were the Fathers; and one fertile cause of dissension and disunion would certainly have never occurred at all, namely, questions between the chiefs of the sanctuary, 'which of them' should be 'greatest' outside it. Is it not a remarkable fact, and one which speaks volumes for the ideal, that the questions which have arisen in the hierarchy on their respective ministrations before God, are as nothing compared with those which have been raised in respect of their precedence before man; indeed, most probably would never have been raised at all but for these last. As far as the sanctuary is concerned, one bishop, one priest, one deacon is as good as another. Christ placed them all, in their several degrees, upon terms of absolute equality as regards His service. Was there any such grave necessity that they should have introduced inequalities amongst themselves, whom even the rite of consecration had left equals?

Against all this, the circumstances in which the lot of the primitive Church was cast remain to be set. It may be doubted whether ages of persecution, such as the three first centuries, did not in reality supply motives for union and detachment from the world that were practically stronger than any others of a more recondite nature while they continued in force, and therefore so much the more calculated to occasion a reaction of feeling when they were withdrawn. Must we, therefore, expect or desire that Christendom should never cease to be persecuted by the powers that be, but have its 'era of martyrs' in every age? After the conversion of Constantine, they were no longer only those who would have died for Christ, that enrolled themselves in His Church. Was it desirable that the many should be for ever excluded from it? And when the civil powers, in gratitude for the countless ameliorations which they saw introduced into public and

private life by the religion of Christ, extended the right hand of fellowship to it, accepted its obligations, seated it upon seats of honour and of social influence, was Christendom precluded by any law of the Gospel from making alliances with those who had hasted to lay their crowns at its feet? Could it not rather see the fulfilment of many a striking prophecy relating to itself in these overtures? This, then, is the real point for consideration. Could Christianity have ever become the religion of the world through human instrumentality, without mixing itself up with the world, or being advanced to honour in the world; especially when amongst its professing members there were many — perhaps the majority of them — only too glad to combine temporal interests with spiritual, their worldly prospects with their Christian calling? How long would the ideal have survived these disturbing influences had it been enforced, and a lower, but very possibly a more working polity not been sanctioned in its stead?

§ 14. *Two Alternatives for the Church.*

Here, therefore, in the next place, I say I cannot imagine but that the *practicable* course lay between these two alternatives:—1. Universal Christendom, united under a single earthly head:—or, 2. As many churches as there were already, or might be, nations; as independent of each other, or as united to each other, in regard to their common faith and discipline,[63] as nations are independent, or united, in view of those common ties which they have by nature. Now, had Christianity been thus split up into national churches—

[63] As has been forcibly said in the case of the existing Church of England, 'What were their ideas as to the relations of the State Church of England to the other Churches of Christendom, whether they expected that the whole Christian world would in the end be converted to the doctrines of the XXXIX. Articles . . . . or whether they were content that *each Christian nation should continue to have its own national religion, and consequently its own national God, after the fashion of polytheistic antiquity*,' &c.—Professor G. Smith's *Plea for the Abolition of Tests*, p. 27.

churches taken into partnership with states—1,500 years ago, who can dispute but that, in all human probability, it would have been extinct now, with most of the blessings which have been derived from what we call European civilisation, unrealised?[64] I draw my inference from what the British Church

[64] It is curious to note the gradations on this point—which may be distinguished as true, more true, most true—between three standard writers, each in point of time succeeding the other, and, as it were, profiting by the juster views that had since dawned. I mean Mr. Hallam, M. Guizot, and Dean Milman.

Mr. Hallam says (*Middle Ages*, c. ix. part i. circa med.): 'Religion alone made a bridge, as it were, across the chaos, and has linked the two periods of ancient and modern civilisation.'

M. Guizot (*Hist. of Civilisation*, vol. i. p. 34): 'I say, the Christian Church, and not Christianity. Had it not been a Church, I cannot say what might have happened to it amid the fall of the Roman Empire. . . . Had Christianity been, as in the earlier times, no more than a belief, a sentiment, an individual conviction, we may believe that it would have sunk amidst the dissolution of the empire and the invasion of the barbarians. . . .'

Dean Milman (*Lat. Christianity*, vol. i. p. 429): 'Now was the crisis in which the Papacy, the only power which lay not entirely and absolutely prostrate before the disasters of the times—which had an inherent strength, and might resume its majesty—the power which was most imperatively required to preserve that which was to survive out of the crumbling wreck of Roman civilisation, must reawaken its obscured and suspended life. *To Western Christianity was absolutely necessary, a centre standing alone, strong in traditionary reverence, and in acknowledged claims to supremacy.* . . . On the rise of a power, both controlling and conservative, hung, humanly speaking, the life and death of Christianity; of Christianity as a permanent, aggressive, expansive, and, to a certain extent, uniform system. There must be a counterbalance to barbaric force, to the unavoidable anarchy of Teutonism, with its tribal, or, at the utmost, national independence, forming a host of small, conflicting, antagonistic kingdoms. . . .' Such is the deliberate conclusion, based upon historical facts, of one of the most intellectual and accomplished of modern historians, with the experience of such men as Messrs. Guizot and Hallam before him. Some successor of his may perchance discover that there are similar reasons for the continuance of the Papacy even in these days. Perhaps they may be found in our own time-honoured constitution.

'The parliament of Great Britain,' says Mr. Burke, 'sits at the head of her extensive empire in two capacities; one as the local legislature of this island, providing for all things at home, immediately, and by no other instrument than the executive power. The other, and I think her nobler capacity, is what I call her imperial character; in which, as from the throne of Heaven, she superintends all the several inferior legislatures, and guides and controls them all without annihilating any. As all these provincial legislatures are only coordinate to each other, they ought all to be subordinate to her; else they can neither preserve mutual peace, nor hope for mutual justice, nor

had come to be—lost to history—till S. Augustine arrived; from what national churches have become within 300 years, with all the manifold advantages of a high state of civilisation on their side, and, what is still more to the point, a great compact body, like that of the Roman Catholic communion, everywhere meeting and keeping them in check. Look at Russia and Greece in the East; look at Sweden, Norway, and Denmark in the West; look at the Protestant churches of Germany, Switzerland, and Scotland in their divided state. The Church of England alone, and the bodies that sprang from it, have any real coherence or vitality: and they are exceptions—destined, perhaps, to play an important part in any future schemes for reunion of the whole Church. Still, even so, national churches themselves witness to the need experienced by Christendom of old, and which ended in the Pope; for they themselves have substituted for him a supreme head in church or state, with whom the final decision of their affairs rests, only it is not reputed infallible. Is there not a Pope of the Greek Church in the Patriarch of Constantinople, or possibly the Sultan; of the Russian Church in the Holy Synod, or rather the Czar; of the Church of England in the Archbishop of Canterbury, or, it may be, the Crown or the Prime Minister? All these, surely, are so many supreme earthly heads? I say, therefore, lastly, that Christendom, divided and split up into factions as it now is, was never more united than it now is upon this one point—namely, that it cannot do without a supreme head upon earth of some kind or other. What has rent Christendom in effect is, that some Christian communities have insisted upon having separate heads of

effectually afford mutual assistance. It is necessary to coerce the negligent, to restrain the violent, and to aid the weak and deficient by the overruling plenitude of her power. She is never to intrude into the place of the others, whilst they are equal to the common ends of their institution. But in order to enable parliament to answer all these ends of provident and beneficent superintendence, her powers must be boundless. The gentlemen who think the powers of parliament limited, may please themselves to talk of requisitions. But suppose the requsitions are not obeyed? Shall there be no reserved power in the empire to supply a deficiency which may weaken, divide, and dissipate the whole?'—*Speech on American Taxation* of April 19, 1774, near the end.

their own choosing—in some cases not even ecclesiastical; while the major part, by far, of Christendom has remained one undivided Church all over the world to this day, by adhering to the ecclesiastical centre that was of old, and is still by it regarded as of Divine appointment—a plain practical proof on all hands, as I conceive, that Christendom, *to exist in all lands*, and be *maintained in corporate unity*, must of necessity be constituted under a single head.[65] In its very divided state, it attests the want both of a supreme head upon earth, and of one head, to be one again.

§ 15. *The Ideal more fit for the Cloister.—The Actual sanctioned in the Synagogue and in the Church.*

I am recording a fact, not advocating a principle, in making this statement. I sincerely believe myself, that a church without endowments, without civil privileges, perfectly detached from the world, hotly persecuted from time to time, without any distinctions of precedence amongst its ministers outside the sanctuary, without any supreme head in or out of the sanctuary but One, who is there worshipped in faith as ever present, is the loftiest and most evangelical idea of a church by far; and that, to a certain extent, this was actually exhibited in the Church of the Fathers—at least of the three first centuries. But I greatly doubt whether this is not a church more fit for the cloister, and one to which the world at large would never have been drawn or belonged. I can see that, even during that brief period of its existence as such, the germs of another constitution, having possibly more of earth in it, but for that very reason more generally popular and attractive, were beginning to show themselves on all sides, as

[65] The headship of emperors is a thing that has been tried and laid aside. What, therefore, remains but that of the Pope? Count de Maistre with good reason considered the following argument, addressed to the Church of England, unanswerable:—'"If you believe the hierarchy necessary in order to maintain unity in the Anglican Church, which is but a single point, how would it not be necessary in order to maintain unity in the universal Church?" I don't believe an Anglican could reply to this in a way to satisfy his conscience.'—*Lettre à une Dame Russe*, vol. ii. p. 285; *Lettres et Opus*, inédit.

though sown broadcast. And I find all explained when I compare the corresponding epochs of the Old and New Testament with each other; for I find that supreme earthly heads were sought and obtained under both dispensations—each suitable for each, in a manner very analogous. Then Israel was united under Saul: Christendom under the emperors. But a change of dynasty had been foreseen, foretold, and provided for in both cases; not that in either case the principle of a supreme earthly potentate had been conceded without reproof. 'That ye may perceive and see that your wickedness is great, which ye have done in the sight of the Lord in asking you a king,'[66] says Samuel, soon after Saul had been proclaimed king. 'Get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an offence to me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men,'[67] said our Lord to that very S. Peter, whom He had but just before designated as 'the rock on which He would build His Church;' neither can one passage be applied to his successors ever without the other. To the disciples generally He twice[68] read similar rebukes when they disputed amongst themselves which of them should be 'the greatest.'

On the other hand, compare those glowing words of old Israel, on his deathbed, to his son Judah, with those glowing words of our Lord, on the eve of His transfiguration,[69] to S. Peter.[70] Compare the rise of the tribe of Judah as detailed in the annals of the Old Testament,[71] with the rise of the see of Rome as detailed[72] in ecclesiastical history; the preference shown for the house of David over the house of Saul in the mind of the Synagogue, with the preference shown

[66] 1 Sam. xii. 17.

[67] S. Matt. xvi. 23.

[68] S. Luke ix. 46, and xxii. 24.

[69] In point of time, of course, six days previously; but as regards recorded events, immediately preceding it.

[70] Gen. xlix. 8, and S. Matt. xvi. 18. The very form of expression is identical in both cases—a play upon names—as Bishop Horsley has observed, Serm. xiii., on S. Matt. v. One begins, 'Thou art Judah, i. e. a thanksgiving;' the other, 'Thou art Peter, i. e. a rock.'—Comp. Corn. a Lap. in *Gen.* l. c.; and see Dean Stanley's *Univ. Sermons*, p. 117.

[71] *V.* Num. vii. 12, x. 14; Judges i. 2; 1 Chron. v. 2, and xxviii. 4; Comp. Joseph. *Ant.* v. 4, and xvii. 14, 9.

[72] See the instances above given, which might be added to considerably.

in the mind of the Church for the ecclesiastical headship of the see of Rome over that of the emperors. Note, finally, that as the kingdom was scarce fully established in the house of David, before Israel and Judah were divided: so likewise that the prerogatives of the see of Rome were scarce fully recognised, before East and West became two separate churches. Who can fail to be struck with the strangeness of coincidence throughout? And, if so, who will dispute that those memorable words of our Lord to S. Peter are to be construed literally? Not, indeed, as though it had been His *primary* will and pleasure that it should be so, as we may gather from His own words immediately following; but that if His Church was to have a supreme head at all upon earth, He vested that dignity in S. Peter and his successors. Not, indeed, that there was not to be a rent in the Church, as there had been in the Synagogue, as one contingent effect of their sovereignty. Not that their history was not destined to be a chequered one, like that of the kings of Judah. But that through their instrumentality, one part of His Church, if not the largest in extent, the most thriving in numbers, the most active, and the most eventful in destiny, might be bound together in one compact mass, and be maintained in all its integrity, comparatively, against all assaults from whatsoever quarter, till His second Advent; and that, like Judah of old, it might exhibit a constant foreshadowing upon earth of the glories of His own future kingdom in heaven.

§ 16. *Eastern and Western Peculiarities compatible with Intercommunion.*

All this, however, was to be carried out by and through the cooperation of human instruments and events; many of them unconscious or undesigned contributors to the results in question, the influence of which I would not be for a moment understood to undervalue or deny. Had Christianity never encountered a world-wide empire at its birth, but only a number of insignificant and detached kingdoms or republics, it is quite possible that the idea of a supreme earthly head of the Church would never have occurred at all to its professing members. Without some general acceptance on

the part of Christendom, the see of Rome would never have seen its prerogatives become law. Had the empire never been divided, the churches of East and West might have never parted company.

Beyond doubt, there were many points on which the genius of East and West differed materially; some of them in themselves calculated to produce estrangement. But, on the other hand, almost all these existed comparatively in full force before, as well as after, their separation. We must beware of falling into that same shortsightedness which has assigned mere geographical or ethnological causes for the origin and progress of the Reformation. Latin, Teutonic, and Scandinavian races formed one household of faith for more than 600 years, whatever they may have done for 300. East and West, similarly, had given vent to their idiosyncrasies,[73] even when they were most united. The Quartodeciman controversy, towards the end of the second, and that about the re-baptism of heretics, towards the middle of the third century, rose to the height of excommunication in each case, but subsided without any schism. The decretal of Siricius,[74] interdicting for ever even the marriage of priests and deacons in the West, was addressed to Himerius, bishop of Tarragona, in A.D. 385, or four years before the death of S. Gregory Nazianzen, who had been born to his father while bishop of that city;[75] but it did not occasion so much as a remark from the East. The West repudiated the twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Chalcedon, and the Trullan canons one and all; but its non-recognition of them involved no rupture;[76] and when, in A.D. 767, the Council of Frankfort

[73] By far the most graphic account of these that I know of is to be found in Dean Stanley's *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church*, particularly Lecture I., on 'The Characteristics of the Eastern Church.' Consciously, I have not borrowed from it, though it is highly satisfactory to find my own views shared by such distinguished men as the Deans of Westminster and S. Paul's.

[74] 'The first *authentic* Decretal.'—*Lat. Christianity*, b. i. c. 2.

[75] As his father's own words to him testify—

Οὔπω τοσοῦτον ἐκμεμέτρηκας βίον,
Ὅσος διῆλθε θυσιῶν ἐμοὶ χρόνος.

(*De Vit. suâ*, v. 512, Op. vol. ii. p. 701, Ed. Ben. See the discussion of them, vol. i. p. lxxxi., by the learned editor.)

[76] So far from it that the very Pope

rejected the decrees of the second Nicene Council, in the matter of images, the Roman pontiffs actually upheld them against the West, till they became law there too. Leo III., in A.D. 809, decided against interpolating the creed of the East, though he pronounced in favour of the doctrine sought to be inserted in it;[77] and even Photius, in his celebrated encyclic[78] of A.D. 867, restricts his denunciations[79] to those 'bishops' who had been tampering with the faith of the Bulgarians. All that he had said or done against Rome did not prevent him from negotiating, on the death of Ignatius in A.D. 878, for his own acknowledgment as patriarch, with John VIII.; or six years subsequently, for the repeal of his condemnation by Marinus, with Adrian III.

§ 17. *Causes of Rupture between East and West; reducible to three Heads.*

What, therefore, was it that caused communion to be broken off definitively between East and West, and made the breach between Michael Cerularius and Leo IX. in A.D. 1054 irreparable? The act of excommunication, of which Michael complained so bitterly,[80] was no new thing on either side, though, possibly, the writ containing it had never been before published with so much solemnity.[81] It was scarce two centuries since anathemas had been exchanged between Adrian I. and Photius—between Photius and Nicholas I. The 6th

who rejected them, Sergius I., was a Syrian by birth; being one of seven successive pontiffs who were either Greeks or Syrians, between A.D. 685 and 715.

[77] See the curious account of this negotiation given at length by Mr. Neale, *Eastern Church*, Gen. Introd., vol. ii. p. 1155–1167.

[78] Addressed to 'the archiepiscopal thrones of the East.' — *Ep.* 2 Ed. Montacute.

[79] Counting them would appear to be as hopeless as the cedars on Mount Lebanon. Mosheim reckons up five charges, Dr. Dollinger six, Dean Milman eight, others ten.

[80] *Ep.* ii. § 4, *ad Pet. Antioch. apud Coteler. Eccl. Gr. Monum.* vol. ii. p. 165.

[81] 'Horâ iii^{ia} die sabbati, chartam excommunicationis super principale altare posuerunt (ecclesiæ S. Sophiæ) sub oculis cleri et populi. Inde mox egressi, etiam pulverem pedum suorum excussere in testimonium illis, dictum Evangelii proclamantes, "Videat Deus et judicet."'—See the *Brevis Commemoratio*, &c., *Canis. Lect. Ant.* ed. Basnage, vol. iii. part i. p. 325. The writ of excommunication follows in full.

General Council had even formally anathematised Honorius I.[82] by name. There had been great violence of language in the sixth century between S. Gregory the Great and John the Faster; not many years previously to which the name of Vigilius had been deliberately erased[83] from every one of the eastern diptychs.

History records no other causes of disunion between East and West in A.D. 1054, but what had been discussed, as much as two centuries back, with warmth, but without involving any lasting breach; and even now, the preeminently sensible patriarch of Antioch, Peter, replied to his colleague of Constantinople, by exculpating the Latins upon all grounds but one, namely, their addition to the creed.[84]

That this was their one *ostensible* cause for separating, I shall proceed to show presently; but that there were two other causes at work, one which even we at this day can scarce be brought to admit; the other gathering strength so insensibly that it was never easy, even for Easterns, to grapple with and unmask, yet both of them operating far more practically than the alleged cause, no one can doubt, who has bestowed any thought upon them.

§ 18. *Sin the principal Cause.—Horrors of the ninth and tenth Centuries.—Instances at Rome and Constantinople.*

First, then, if there has been any truth at all in the analogy which has been drawn between the events of the

[82] Action xii., *Mansi*, tom. xi. p. 872. 'Præter hos autem, ex sanctâ quoque Dei Ecclesiâ ejici, et anathemate feriri, censemus Honorium, quondam Papam Romæ veteris.' Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter, patriarchs of Constantinople, and Cyrus of Alexandria, shared the same fate. Sophronius of Jerusalem was pronounced orthodox. The legates of Agatho, who were present, raised no objection to this even-handed justice; and it is not a little curious that Agatho, when enumerating the Monothelite leaders in his letter to the emperor, says nothing for or against, or even about, Honorius; of whose correspondence with Sergius he could not be ignorant.

[83] Michael, *Ep.* i. ad *Pet. Antioch.* § 9 is of course incorrect; but Peter, in § 4 of his reply, probably understates rather than overstates the fact. —Ap. Cotel. as before.

[84] Ap. Coteler. *Eccl. Gr. Monum.* vol. ii. p. 161 (§ 22). *Ὡς ἐγωγε τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην φανερῶ, εἰ τὴν τῷ ἁγίῳ συμβόλῳ προσθήκην διορθώσαιντο, οὐδὲν ἂν ἕτερον ἐπεζήτουν.*

Jewish and Christian dispensations, it will appear that schism in each case had been foreordained as a judgment for sin. 'Thus saith the Lord,[85] . . . this thing is from me: Because they have forsaken me, and have worshipped Ashtoreth the goddess of the Zidonians, Chemosh the god of the Moabites, and Milcom the god of the children of Ammon, and have not walked in my ways . . .' Such was the authoritative explanation of the 'rent' between Israel and Judah. Can any one deny but that a truer description could not have been given of Christendom between the age of Photius and of Michael? Was there ever a period when civilisation had sunk to a lower ebb amongst civilised nations, or Christianity been in greater danger of extinction from the vices of its own clergy and laity? What! are sins to be kept out of sight in estimating the sequences between cause and effect in any history of the people of God? As well might secular histories attempt to ignore the freedom of the will, or take no account of the prudence and folly of individuals, or of nations, as directly bringing about events of a prosperous or disastrous character. The ecclesiastical historian is bound to go for his model to the inspired penmen of the Books of Kings and of Chronicles, and not to gloss over, in the smallest degree, the worst sins even of his Davids and Solomons, any more than those of collective Judah and Israel. Imagine, then, Photius, that champion of Greek orthodoxy, boasting that he had drunk sixty cups of wine to his emperor's fifty, and had not been intoxicated.[86] Conceive the patriarch who could be indifferent when the holiest rites of religion were lampooned in his presence,[87] and when the corpse of one of his own predecessors was disinterred, publicly stripped, scourged, and burnt, by order of his brutal patron, Michael III.[88] Worse deeds than even

[85] 1 Kings xii. 24, and xi. 33.

[86] Ἀμιλλαν . . . ὑπὲρ τοῦ τίς ἂν πλέον πιέι ἐνστησάμενος, δέκα κώθωσιν αὐτὸν ὑπερέβαλλεν· τοῦ γὰρ Μιχάηλ ἐν τοῖς ν'· πεπληρωμένου, οὗτος ὁ Φώτιος τοὺς ξ'· ἐκπεπωκὼς, ἐνεκαυχᾶτο ὡς μὴ μεμεθυκώς. — Symeon Mag. *Annal. ap. Hist. Byz. Script. p. Theophan*, § 19 (Michael and Theodora).

[87] Ibid.

[88] Ibid. § 45. John may not have been without his faults, but he had been tutor of Theophilus, Michael's own father. *Gibbon*, c. 48, dwells

this had been perpetrated at Rome by the first of Christian bishops before that century closed. Stephen VI.,[89] assisted by one who afterwards became Pope, had the body of his own predecessor and consecrator, Formosus, exhumed, arrayed in pontificals, and carried before a mock synod. Sentence of degradation having been pronounced, it was stripped and put into secular clothing, and the fingers that had given benediction having been cut off, it was ignominiously thrown into the Tiber. The see of Rome was now virtually in the hands of Theodora and Merozia; and to have been one of their sons, or paramours, the surest title to it. Yet, fifty years hence, and the picture both of Rome and of Constantinople is unchanged. Theophylact had been elected patriarch at the age of sixteen, and even for some time, as patriarch, retained his tutors.[90] John XII. was but two years older when elected Pope. The only anecdote told of the first is,[91] that one day as he was engaged in officiating at the church of S. Sophia, his groom, who was in attendance, came up and whispered to him that one of his favourite mares had foaled. Theophylact broke off the service abruptly, visited his stud, inspected the new-comer, and then returned back to church to finish his ministrations. Such was the story bruited about his own diocese of the patriarch of the second see of Christendom.

upon Michael's crimes; and c. 60, upon the purity of Photius' morals: but nowhere notices this connection between the latter and the former.

[89] Sigeberti, *Gembl. Chron.* ad A.D. 902, speaking of Stephen: 'Hic primùm a Formoso Papâ episcopus Anaguinæ ecclesiæ ordinatus, ipsum Formosum prosequitur, et ordinationes ejus omnes irritas esse debere decernit . . .'. Ipse, et non Sergius, corpus Formosi a sepulchro in concilio protractum, et papali veste exutum, laicali induit, et abscissis duobus digitis dexteræ manûs ejus, in Tiberim præcipitari fecit . . .' All which Luitprand, *Antapod.* lib. i. 30 (ap. Migne, *Patrol. C. C.* vol. cxxxvi.) describes as the work of Sergius III. The author of the life of Formosus is probably right in making them joint actors in it—'per ignorantiam facti (!), vel *per summum sacrilegium*'—and in placing it under the pontificate of Stephen, A.D. 896 (ap. *Mansi*, tom. xviii. pp. 99, 174, and 250). On the other hand, see Morinus ad Auxilium—'De ordin. a Formoso factis,' ap. *Max. Bibl. Vet. Pat.* tom. xvii. p. 1 et seq.

[90] 'Ἐξ καίδεκα μὲν ἐτῶν ὅτε ἀκανονίστως τοὺς τῆς ἐκκλησίας περιείληφεν οἴακας, ὑπὸ παιδαγωγοὺς (φεῦ μοι) ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς μέχρι τινὸς διατελέσας'—Georg. Cedren. *Hist. Compend.* pars ii. p. 638 (ed. Fabrot).

[91] Ibid.

The Greek historian who records it very pertinently remarks, that the patriarchs of Constantinople and of Rome—mentioning John by name—were well matched. Imagine our intrepid and high-souled S. Dunstan making a journey to Rome[92] to receive his pall from one whose evil report had spread so far and wide that even at Constantinople men described him as 'πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀσέλγειαν καὶ κακίαν ὑπάρχων ἐπιῤῥεπής,'[93] and whose own cardinals and bishops, clergy and people,[94] demanded his deposition, at the end of nine years, for crimes which Otho well stigmatised as, 'tam obscœna, ut si de histrionibus dicerentur, verecundiam nobis ingererent . . .' His death was as disgraceful as his life had been; not, however, till he had directed the affairs of the Church for ten years as Pope. A letter to him from the austere Bishop of Verona, Ratherius, may illustrate how matters were managed in those days. Ratherius complains that he was forcibly kept out of his see by the boy Milo,[95] to whom it had been sold by Manasses, the pluralist Archbishop of Milan, then the unlawful occupant of no less than five sees—Arles, Verona, Mantua, Trent, and Milan;[96] but the worst part of it all was, that 'the abettors of this outrage boasted that it had been sanctioned by the Apostolic see.[97] His appeal lay unheeded till

[92] A.D. 960. See *Florence of Worcester*, p. 103 (Forester's Tr.), *Hoveden*, vol. i. p. 73 (Riley's Tr.); and yet, in point of fact, the story told of Elfsine, S. Dunstan's own immediate predecessor, almost equals, in brutality and depravity, that of Stephen VI. Still it is the only one of the kind occurring in the history of the seventy archbishops of Canterbury, between S. Augustine and Warham; and there is a far greater percentage of such stories in the history of the 220 popes between S. Peter and Leo X.—*V.* Osbern in *Vit. Odon.* ad f.; and Wharton's note; and Lingard's *Anglo-Saxon Ch.* vol. ii. p. 282, note.

[93] Cedrenus, ibid. p. 640.

[94] As stated by Luitprand, bishop of Cremona, who was present. They made oath of these charges, and were prepared to substantiate them.—De Reb. *Otton. M.* § 11; ap. Migne, *Patrol. C. C.* vol. cxxxvi. p. 904; and Sigebert, *Gemb. Chron.* ed. A.D. 963.

[95] 'Nepotulum, eum auctor appellat, quia erat adolescentulus annorum circiter 18.'—Ballerin ad l. John could therefore sympathise with him.

[96] Comp. Luitprand, *Antapod.* iv. 6. Manasses defended himself by saying that S. Peter had been a pluralist too; having held Alexandria, Rome, Antioch, and Aquileia at the same time.

[97] This, his editor thinks, had been rather the decision of Agapetus II. than of John; the words are 'Fautores hujusmodi ordinationis licentiam accepisse gleriantur ab apostolatu vestræ dominationis.'—Rather. *Ep.* v. 6–8;

Otho procured his restitution in A.D. 961. Facts, indeed, these for his celebrated work, 'De Contemptu Canonum,'[98] addressed to a brother bishop. John XIX. was a layman when his brother Benedict died, but was elected to succeed him in A.D. 1024, by dint of bribery; and such was his venal character all over the world, that on the one hand an embassy was despatched to him from Constantinople to purchase privileges for that see, which he was very near selling;[99] and on the other hand, our own Canute expressed to him in person, and in terms not to be trifled with, 'his high displeasure, that his archbishops were sorely aggrieved by the demand of immense sums of money, when, according to custom, they resorted to the Apostolic see to obtain the pall.'[100] The royal complainant assures Archbishop Ethelnoth, and others to whom he is writing, that 'it had been decreed this should be no longer done.' Two years later, and what redress could even Canute have obtained? John had then been succeeded by his nephew, Theophylact, a boy of ten or twelve years old—for in this alone accounts vary—who for eleven or twelve years sat as Pope, under the name of Benedict IX., and for many years longer kept Rome in a state of schism and turmoil, by struggling against his repeated ejectments. 'His life,' says a contemporary, who subsequently became Pope, 'was so base, foul, and execrable, even after obtaining the priesthood, that I shudder to tell of it.'[101] It is only fair to add that he repented of his crimes, which John XII. did not; but, luckily for Christendom, and for the world at large, long before his death, which only took place in A.D. 1065, the mighty master-mind of Hildebrand had conceived and organised a revolution, which rescued religion from its state of degradation in Europe, though it came too late to save the East. There, at all events, the scourge,

ap. Migne, *Patrol. C. C.* vol. cxxxvi. p. 660–2; also Vit. Rather. ibid. § 13.

[98] Ibid. p. 486–522.

[99] Glaber Radulphus, *Hist.* iv. c. 1, quoted at length in a former note to p. 39.

[100] *Florence of Worcester Chron.* A.D. 1031; comp. Wilkins, *Concil.* vol. i. p. 297.

[101] *Desider. Dialog.* lib. iii. c. 1; ap. Mabill. *Act. Ben.* vol. vi. p. 460. He became pope in A.D. 1086, under the name of Victor III.—Comp. Glab. Rad. *Hist.* iv. 5.

which union with the West might have averted, descended with full force, amply bearing out the prophetic words of that Peter who has been already cited: 'Consider[102] whether it be not clearly from hence, namely, from this our long-continued division and separation, the severance of this great and Apostolic throne from our Holy Church, that every social evil has come to be multiplied, and the whole world to be in a bad plight, so that all the kingdoms of the earth are in confusion; and that there is wailing and woe, famine and pestilence, in town and in country, without end, everywhere; so that in no quarter do our hosts at all prosper.' In less than twenty-five years after that schism commenced, the Turks had become masters of Palestine; in less than half that time after its accommodation by the Council of Florence had been rejected, they had become masters of Constantinople.

§ 19. *Second Cause.—Rise of the Temporal Power.—The whole West a party to it.—Moral Power against brute Force.*

And, now, that other cause, which had long been working estrangement between East and West, but had from time to time been thrown back, and, *but for sin, might have been overruled in its effects*, began to assume proportions under Gregory VII. and his successors, that must, in the eyes of the Greeks, those obstinate pleaders for antiquity, have gone far to reconcile them to their isolation. Honorary precedence they had even themselves claimed for Rome, especially when vindicating for their own pet see the next place: its jurisdiction they had likewise admitted in exceptional or extreme cases, or when in conformity with their interests, and they were perfectly content that it should always exercise any amount of summary jurisdiction over the West. But for the supremacy, which, backed by temporal possessions and temporal pretensions, threatened to make and unmake kings and emperors, as well as bishops and archbishops, and prostrate all Christendom at its feet as suppliants, they were

[102] *Ep. ad Mich. C. P.* § 21, as before.

wholly unprepared. They looked on in amaze; they could find no sort of precedent for it in their ancient canons; and in their inmost souls they must have congratulated themselves both in church and state, that their present attitude, at all events, secured them against any such startling encroachments upon their primeval rights. The language of the Popedom had undoubtedly become, to all who came into contact with it, more and more that of the young men, which the son of Solomon adopted as his own:[103] 'My little finger shall be thicker than my father's loins . . . Whereas my father did lade you with a heavy yoke, I will add to your yoke: my father hath chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions.' Temporal prerogatives were set up, that threw ecclesiastical prerogatives, at their highest, into the shade: not only were heretics and evildoers excommunicated, but interdicts began to be laid upon whole kingdoms. Still, what may have been oppression in Judah, was very necessary discipline for feudal and uncivilised Europe. Hard times justified hard measures. As long as the spiritual power fought exclusively for the interests of religion and morality, public opinion responded to its loftiest claims, nor even now is it intolerant of them in a just cause. Some principles there are whose nature is best appreciated in their fruits. The modern historian of the Italian republics dwells eloquently on the fact that Italy recivilised Europe. As little can it be denied that Rome recivilised Italy. Above all, it should never be forgotten that the '180,000 chosen men[104] who were warriors,' whom Rehoboam could muster in support of his claims, have been wholly wanting to the Papacy, except, indeed, in the sense in which Napoleon I. apostrophised it,[105]

[103] 1 Kings xii. 10, 11. Sir James Stephen expresses the then current doctrine thus:—'A Divine right to universal obedience was the inalienable attribute of the Roman pontiffs, of whom, as supreme earthly Suzerain, emperors and kings held their crowns, patriarchs and bishops their mitres; and held them not mediately, through each other, but immediately, as tenants "in capite," from the one legitimate representative of the great Apostle . . .' *Essays*, p. 17 (Hildebrand).

[104] Ibid. v. 21.

[105] 'Traitez le Pape, comme s'il avait deux cent mille hommes.'—*Speech of the First Consul to Cacault.* Rohrbacher, *E. H.* vol. 27, p. 637.

when, to all appearance, it lay at his feet. The most superficial reader of history cannot fail to have perceived that the Popes were staters, and not makers, of the power that came to them, in church and in state, day by day. They had no means, on the whole, of obtaining, or of adding to it, by force of arms, whether by land or sea. Either they claimed no more than what others were disposed to accord, or else they accepted what others bestowed of their own free will. Much of their medieval ascendency has been ascribed to the false Decretals; as if those Decretals had supplied them with the equivalent of a standing army! There does not appear to be the smallest probability that any pope had a hand in forging them. Their birthplace, like that of the interpolated creed, was either Spain or France—the westernmost of the West—and they only expressed the received opinions of those days; namely, of the eighth and ninth centuries. It certainly was no pope who compiled the 'Decretum' of Gratian, or the 'Summa Theologica' of S. Thomas Aquinas. Pope after pope unquestionably insisted upon the spiritual claims of his see, but bishops and archbishops accepted them, councils ratified them, monks and friars invoked them, canonists and schoolmen consolidated them as the basis of their respective systems, and fortified them by all the arguments which at that date were thought most cogent and unanswerable.[106] Its cause was looked upon during the influx

Dean Milman expresses himself no less eloquently than faithfully on the occasion of the deposition of Henry IV. of Germany, thus: 'When the Senate or the Emperors of Rome issued their mandates to the extremity of the world, they were known to be supported by vast and innumerable armies. *The mandates of Hildebrand were to promulgate, to execute themselves.*'—*Lat. Christianity*, b. vii. c. 2, circa med. Kings and nations, of course, frequently sided with popes, and fought for them. It rarely happened that popes ever fought for themselves.—On which see De Maistre, *Du Pape*, lib. ii. c. 6.

[106] For this whole subject see Gieseler, *E. H.* per. iii. div. i. §§ 7, 20, with the notes, Eng. Tr., whose admissions are considerable; and Alzog. *E. H.* § 186, French Tr., who is no less unbiassed on the other side. As Sir James Stephen has very truthfully said, 'It was a conflict of mental with physical power, of literature with ignorance, of religion with injustice and debauchery. To the popes of the Middle Ages was assigned a province, the abandonment of which would have

of barbarism, and in the days of feudalism, as that of moral power and of law against brute force, as the one tie that bound together the disjointed nationalities of Europe as one family; and the vitality which it revealed in recovering itself from its worst periods of oppression and degradation, fully bore out the current idea that the hand of God was upon it, and that it rested upon mightier and more durable foundations than any other earthly potentate. 'Ex uno disce omnes.' A great deal has been written on the subjugation of British Christianity to the see of Rome. How was it accomplished? By the teaching and preaching of two unarmed monks and those who accompanied them, SS. Augustine and Theodore. What was the nature of the force employed to compel Plegmund, Odo, Dunstan, Ethelnoth, the most celebrated of their Anglo-Saxon successors, to go to Rome for their palls in those dark ages, when travelling was so perilous, and when the personal character of the bishops of Rome must have filled them with so much abhorrence? Two of our greatest archbishops, SS. Anselm and Thomas of Canterbury, may be said to have pleaded the cause of the Papacy at the risk of their lives, against the popes themselves, so little assistance or encouragement did they receive from Rome.

§ 20. *Temporal Pretensions and Possessions of the Roman See.*

The temporal pretensions and possessions of the see of Rome, similarly, originated with free-gifts in the first instance, and not—till these had been accepted and held for some time—claims. The first temporal cause in which a pope was ever asked to interfere—in which his judgment brought about a national revolution by becoming law—was the deposition of a king, of whose hereditary rights there had never been any question at all. Zachariah adjudicated upon the case as it had been laid before him. Childeric III. ended his days in a

plunged the Church and the world into hopeless slavery. To Pope Gregory VII. were given the genius and the courage to raise himself and his successors to the level of that high vocation.'—*Essays*, ibid. p. 55. He modifies this, indeed, by what he adds about spiritual despotism.

monastery; and Pepin, who had been crowned previously by S. Boniface, Zachariah's legate, received his crown a second time, A.D. 753, in the abbey-church of S. Denis, at the hands of Stephen III., who had come the whole way from Rome to place it on his head.[107]

Singularly enough, therefore, the act of 'discrowning' came first, and that of crowning afterwards, in the history of the popes. And they performed both equally by invitation.[108] And, as they began by crowning kings in the eighth century, so in the ninth they commenced crowning emperors—a practice which, in spite of all the depositions that have been its inseparable correlatives, they have not only been never allowed to drop during the whole 1,000 years intervening between Charlemagne and Napoleon I., but have even within these last ten years, if report says true, been again and again importuned, in more than one quarter, to resume. Nor can modern Europe be so uncandid as to deny that the credit of having first taught that, even under the Gospel, kings and emperors oppressing their subjects unlawfully, may be resisted lawfully, belongs to the Papacy.

I must be limited in these references; but there is one case too interesting for us, as Englishmen, to be left any longer, as it has been, comparatively unnoticed. Our own William the Conqueror was not so sure of his title to the crown of England, but he must get it confirmed by Alexander II.[109] his own elevation of course involving the deposition of Harold, then reigning, with full consent of the English

[107] On this event, and its consequences, see Mr. Hallam's *Middle Ages*, c. 1, part 1, and Gieseler, *E. H.* per. iii. div. i. § 5.

[108] Hence the following passage is scarcely accurate as to *facts*: 'The part taken by the pope in the offer of the empire to Charlemagne, his coronation by the hands of the pope in the same manner, gave a vague notion, a notion to be matured by time, that it was a papal grant. He who could bestow could withhold; and, as *it was afterwards maintained*, he who could elevate could degrade; he who could crown, could discrown, the emperor.' —*Lat. Christian.* b. v. c. 1. Hildebrand had not far to look for precedents. He had himself, *in fact*, adjudged the crown of England to William I. which involved the exclusion of Harold.

[109] Wm. of Malmesbury, p. 273, Giles' *Tr.* and Math. Par. ad A.D. 1066: 'Ut susceptum negotium auctoritate Apostolicâ firmaretur.'

people. That the pope sent him a standard as a presage of victory, and that he conquered, is well-known. What is less generally known is, the deposition of archbishop Stigand, and all the Saxon bishops and abbots who refused allegiance to William, through the medium of the legates of Alexander, in the synod of Winchester, A.D. 1070;[110] just as, some 730 years afterwards, the French episcopate was reconstituted by the joint action of Pius VII. and Napoleon I. It is curious that the precedent of the ejected Saxon bishops of the eleventh, should never have been pressed against the 'Petite Eglise' of the nineteenth century, while the precedents of Pepin and of Charlemagne were on the lips of everybody in France on the memorable event of December 2, 1804.[111]

Once more, the same age that invited temporal pretensions on the part of the pope constituted him by the best right in the world—by free gift of territory—temporal sovereign. Astolph had yielded it; ambassadors from Constantinople claimed it; Pepin, who might have kept it for his own, solemnly bestowed it upon the see of Rome. In the words of Dean Milman:[112]

'Pepin declared that his sole object in the war was to show his veneration for S. Peter; and he bestowed—as it seems—by the right of conquest, the whole upon the pope. The representatives of the pope, who, however, always speak of the republic of Rome, passed through the land receiving the

[110] In the summons issued by the legates it is said, 'Licet Romana ecclesia circa correctionem omnium Christianorum invigilare debeat, specialius tamen ei conversationis vestræ mores convenit inquirere, et Christianam religionem, quâ vos primitus instruxit, diligentiâ suæ visitationis reparare . . . ut concilium vobiscum celebraturi, quæ in vineâ Domini Sabaoth male pullulant resecemus et animarum et corporum utilitati profutura plantemus.' We get at the true grounds from Hoveden: 'Operam dante Rege, ut quamplures ex Anglis, suis honoribus privarentur, in quorum loco suæ gentis personas subrogaret. . . . Hinc et nonnullos tam Episcopos, quam Abbates, quos nullâ evidenti causâ, nec Concilia, nec leges seculi damnabant, suis honoribus privavit.' —Wilkins, *Concil.* vol. i. p. 322, 3. Comp. *Lat. Christianity*, b. vii. c. 1, ad f., and for the modern parallel, Rohrbacker, *E. H.* vol. xxvii. pp. 636–41.

[111] Dwelt upon in all the speeches and addresses made to Pius VII. Rohrbacker, vol. xxviii. p. 39 *et seq.*, as if it had been the birth of a new phœnix at the end of 1000 years.

[112] *Lat. Christianity*, b. iv. c. 11.

homage of the authorities, and the keys of the cities. The district comprehended Ravenna, Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Cesena, Sinigaglia, Iesi, Forlimpopoli, Forli, with the castle Sussibio, Montefeltro, Acerra, Monti di Lucano, Serra, San Martino, Bobbio, Urbino, Cagli, Luciolo, Gubbio, Comachio, and Narni, which was severed from the dukedom of Spoleto. Thus the successor, as he was declared, of the fisherman of the Galilean lake, the apostle of Him whose kingdom was not of this world, became a temporal sovereign. By the gift of a foreign potentate, this large part of Italy became the kingdom of the bishop of Rome.'

It would certainly be hard, amongst 'the kingdoms of this world,' to point out one that had been similarly acquired. Neither the fact nor the lawfulness of this donation has ever therefore been disputed; and it so happens that, in point of time, it preceded, by nearly 100 years, the forgery of the charter of donation by Constantine; which last, accordingly, was mere fiction founded upon fact.[113] It was formally renewed, if not amplified, by Charlemagne;[114] then, it remained in comparative abeyance during that fierce period when the counts of Tusculum and of Tuscany reigned paramount; and then came the deed of the great countess, who bestowed all her allodial possessions in perpetuity upon the see of Rome,[115] which, for a time, had but the effect of adding fuel to the conflict that was now raging between popes and emperors. At length, Lothair III., in A.D. 1133, formally recognised the grant of Matilda, by receiving her lands in fee from Innocent II.;[116] and, later still, the unimpeachable founder of the House of Hapsburg, Rodolph, in A.D. 1278, 'absolutely released the imperial supremacy over all the dominions already granted to the Holy See.'[117]

[113] Gieseler, *E. H.* per. iii. div. ii. § 20, note 20 (and § 5, note 18). The way in which he would account for the forgery is far from improbable.

[114] *Lat. Christianity*, b. iv. c. 12.

[115] Ibid. per. iii. div. iii. § 49, note 23.

[116] Gieseler, *E. H.* per. iii. div. iii. § 51.

[117] Hallam, *Middle Ages*, c. iii. part ii. Comp. Gieseler, per. iii. div. iii. § 58, note 10. But the proper place to study all these documents now is the magnificent work of Father A. Theiner, entitled *Codex Diplomaticus Dominii Temporalis S. Sedis*, 3 vols. fol. Rome, 1862, extending

§ 21. *Rome and Constantinople in their altered Relations.*

We have nothing to do, therefore, but contrast Rome and Constantinople under their altered circumstances, in order to see why the breach between them in the eleventh century proved so much more fatal in its effects than any that had occurred before. From the days of Pepin and of Charlemagne, a vast revolution had been impending between the relative positions of the two sees; it had been thrown back by their mutual degradation and prostration in the ninth and tenth centuries; but, under the popes who succeeded Gregory VII. in the West, and under the sultans who succeeded Alp Arslan in the East, it made great progress on both sides, till at length there was scarcely any comparison left, but in name, between them; and every succeeding event only increased their disparity. The one had gone up as steadily as the other had gone down; the one had become the acknowledged head of Christianised Europe, both in church and state; the other, ... the most trampled-on institution of a debased empire, nine-tenths of which had been torn away by violence, unchristianised, and forced to embrace a rival creed. Could Rome exercise unqualified supremacy over the strong, and stirring,

from A.D. 756 to A.D. 1793. In his preface to vol. i. the Editor, appealing to them, says: 'Tous les empereurs d'Occident qui succédèrent à Charlemagne avaient confirmé aux papes la donation de Pepin. Après ce roi, et surtout après la translation de la dignité impériale de la maison de France à celle d'Allemagne, il s'était formé entre le Saint Siége et les empereurs des rapports intimes, dont la première condition était, qu'aucun empereur d'Allemagne, en prenant en même temps le titre d'empereur romain, ne put être reconnu comme tel, et recevoir du pape la couronne impériale, s'il n'avait pas, avant son couronnement, confirmé par serment au Saint Siége la donation de Pepin, et renouvelé les confirmations de cette même donation faites par les empereurs ses prédécesseurs. Dans ces confirmations, les empereurs ne reconnaissaient pas seulement la donation de Pepin, mais ils juraient aussi de conserver aux papes leurs états, et de les défendre dans la possession légitime et pacifique de leurs droits, contre tous ceux qui tenteraient de les contester.' In his preface to vol. ii. he adds: 'Les documents contenus dans ce second et troisième volume réfuteront de nouveau, d'une manière victorieuse, l'erreur de ceux qui s'obstinent . . . à soutenir que les papes n'ont guère, avant le 16ème siècle, exercé la souveraineté temporelle sur les sujets de leurs états.'

and many-peopled West, and be content with honorary precedence, or even appellate jurisdiction, over the imprisoned East? Besides, had she wished it ever so, could she possibly have excepted the East from the effect of those centralising influences that were abroad, and at work, so much to her own manifest advantage, that she could hardly be expected to take any active part in stemming or disowning them? When canonists and schoolmen were telling the pope that he was above law, and the supreme arbiter upon earth of all law, human or divine,[118] was it to be expected that he should step in, and assert his own subordination to the canons of the Greek church; when all Western archbishops were content to look upon the pope as their lawful suzerain, and themselves as his vicars,[119] was it to be expected that he should tell the powerless patriarchs of the East that they alone owed him no such allegiance? We in England are not over-enamoured of the principle of centralisation, and in some respects are disposed to view it as so much unmixed evil. Yet how much better, on the whole, do we think it that all causes of importance should be tried in London than in the provinces; and, even if we were not of that opinion ourselves, how could we inveigh against it as a relic of barbarism, seeing that it commenced with imperial Rome, and has been clung to under every possible form of government, by our polite neighbours, ever since their great social revolution of A.D. 1789.

§ 22. *Principle of Centralisation.—Its Merits and natural Results.*

The business of Christendom in the West came to be as regularly transacted at Rome as the business of England in

[118] The natural inference from the position, 'a nullo judicatur.'—See Gratian *Dec.* part i. dist. xl. c. 6; part ii. cause ix. quæst. 3, c. 10 *et seq.*; also cause xvii. quæst. 4, c. 30, with the glosses.

[119] 'Omnem jurisdictionem episcoporum non esse proximè a Deo, sed per interpositam Romani pontificis personam . . . Hæc sententia est verissima, et, teste Cajetano, omnium theologorum et doctorum Catholicorum testimonio comprobata.' Azor. *Inst. Mor.* pars ii. lib. iii. c. 30. The Spanish bishops, indeed, attacked this position at the Council of Trent (Sess. xxiii. See Waterworth, p. ccii. *et seq.*), but were overruled.

London, and, still more, of France in Paris. The episcopal or archiepiscopal courts throughout Europe became as the local courts of judicature, the assizes or county-courts, in our own country, but every cause of importance was sent to Rome by common consent. There was naturally more general experience, and a greater array of authorities upon canon law, to be found in the metropolis than in any provincial town. For the same reason, there was likely to be less of local prejudice, and not necessarily, let us hope—otherwise what protection can we look for, or bid our posterity look for, against it in London and Paris?—more bribery and corruption. Suitors and judges reacted upon each other; the greater number there were of suitors, the better the judge was paid, and the more considerable came to be his functions. As one court got more to do than it could perform, another was organised; as suits became more complicate, courts of revision and of appeal had to be formed. Hence, the origin of that elaborate system of tribunals and congregations for ecclesiastical suits and affairs with which Rome abounds, of which that of the Segnatura, the Dateria, and Rota, on the one hand, and of the Index, Inquisition, and Propaganda, on the other, are specimens.[120]

[120] 'About the twelfth century,' says Moroni (*Dizion.* vol. xvii. p. 296, but the whole passage is borrowed from Lunadoro), 'a distinction began to be made between the Court of Rome and the Holy or Apostolic See. Thus Geroo writes to Eugenius III. (elected A.D. 1145): "Neque enim vel hoc ipsum carere maculâ videtur, quod nunc dicitur Curia Romana, quæ antehac dicebatur Ecclesia Romana. Nam si revolvantur antiqua Romanorum pontificum scripta, nusquam in vis reperitur hoc nomen, quod est curia, in designatione sacrosanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ, quæ rectius ecclesia, quam curia, nominatur." The ground of this distinction is unfortunately made too plain by the friend and master of Eugenius, S. Bernard, in his work *De Consideratione*, e. g. lib. i. c. 4; lib. ii. c. 2; lib. iii. c. 4. Comp. John of Salisbury, *De Nugis Cur.* lib. vi. c. 23, and Mathew of Cracow, De Squal. *Rom. Curiæ*, in Brown's *Fascic.* app. p. 585.

Under the head 'Famiglia Pontificia' (Moroni, vol. xxiii. p. 73), we have the roll, amongst others, of Paul IV. drawn up in A.D. 1555, containing a total as follows:—

'Famigliari	421
Servi di Palazzo pei Medesimi	313
I quali riuniti formano .	734

individui, che diconsi mantenuti a tutto vitto.' And there were others who were but partially maintained. The

The influx of applicants brought about their establishment in the first instance: once established, they would naturally

roll of Pius VI., drawn up in A.D. 1778, differs considerably from the preceding.—Ibid.

Now for the court, as such. Lunadoro, in his *Relazione della Corte di Roma* (ed. 1824, Rome, part i. p. 7), says: 'Cardinali, Prelati, Ministri, formano la Corte di Roma. Il capo e principe porta il nome di Papa . . . Li Cardinali sono suoi consiglieri: gli ambasciatori di lui ordinari diconsi Nuntzi: Legati vengono detti gli ambasciatori estraordinari, e governatori delle provincie. Li consigli tanto intorno agli affari della religione, quanto que' che si tengono per gl' interessi di stato, si chiamano Congregazioni: le jurisdizioni Rote: li tribunali per le spedizioni delle bolle Dataria,' &c.

Then in Part II. we have the following 'Congregations' treated of:—

1. Concistoriale.
2. De' Capi d'Ordini.
3. Dell' immunità Ecclesiastica.
4. Della sagra Inquisizione.
5. Dell' Indice.
6. Del Concilio.
7. De' Vescovi e de' Regolari.
8. Per l'Elezione, per l'Esame, per la residenza de' Vescovi.
9. Della Disciplina Religiosa.
10. De' Sacri Riti.
11. Del Cerimoniale.
12. Dell' indulgenze e delle Sacre Reliquie.
13. De Propaganda Fide.
14. Della Sagra Consulta.
15. Del Buon Governo.
16. De' Baroni.
17. Della reverenda Fabrica di S. Pietro.
18. Della Visita Apostolica.
19. Delli Revisioni delle Messe.
20. Della Visita delle Carceri.
21. Criminale.

To which Moroni (vol. xvi. p. 152) adds—

1. Del censo.
2. Sopra la Correzione de' libri della Chiesa Orientale.
3. Delle Acque.
4. Economica.
5. Lauretana.
6. Revisione de' Conti.
7. Della Segnatura di Grazia.
8. Sanitaria.
9. Degli Studi.
10. Affari ecclesiastici straordinari.
11. Per la riedificazione di S. Paolo.

And the *Roman Almanac for* 1857 adds—

1. Araldica.
2. S. Ivo.

Finally, Moroni (vol. lxxx. p. 164) enumerates its existing tribunals, as follows:—

1. Penitenzieria Apostolica.
2. Cancelleria Apostolica.
3. Dateria Apostolica.
4. Rota Romana.
5. Camera Apostolica.
6. Segnatura di Giustizia.
7. Del Vicario di Roma.
8. Civile di Roma.
9. Di Commercio.
10. Criminale di Roma.

The list given in the *Roman Almanac for* 1857 is slightly different. The ablest sketch that I know of in a small compass, and for days gone by, is entitled *Discours Politique de l'Estat de Rome*, dedicated 'Au Roy très-Chrétien,' dated '1604 à Paris,' and signed 'I. B. D. S.' But it was not actually printed till 1626. It is a small octavo vol.; and it appears from its preface that its author had often been at Rome, and for a considerable time together, during a period of

cast about for employment, and those causes which had been already decided in them would serve as precedents. They would only be doing what all other courts have done before or since, if they contended that all such causes, all over Christendom, fell within their jurisdiction, and were to be brought under their cognisance. Any country lawyer in England is capable of saying not only what cases cannot be tried in county-courts or at the assizes, but into which of the courts in London, Queen's Bench or Chancery, Common Pleas or Exchequer, they should be taken; and, the maintenance of all courts depending to some extent upon fees, it is in very self-support that they grasp at all business for which they can show any legal title. Shall we say that the ecclesiastical courts of Rome have been graspers above all other courts? It is the most, at all events, that can be laid to their charge.

But, grasp as they might, they would have long since dwindled away into nothingness, had not two things concurred for their maintenance—1. A general disposition on the part of Christendom in the West to resort to them; and—2. The temporal sovereignty of the pope over that city, at any rate, in which they had their existence. Christendom might be ever so willing to refer all its causes of importance to the see of Rome; but, certainly, were the king of Italy, and not the pope, master of Rome, it may well be doubted whether a single cause would ever find its way there. Let those who think so bring forward a single precedent in point, in the known world, where persons are in the habit of submitting their highest interests to be determined by the tribunals of one who is himself the subject of some potentate not their own. It can scarce require to be stated, to be pronounced absurd. And, therefore, for all those who are in favour of that position which Rome has for so many centuries occupied, as the centre of ecclesiastical jurisdiction for all churches in

twenty-eight years, in the service of the then king of France (Henri IV.) and his predecessor. It is a very careful historical resumé of the origin and actual condition of the temporal government of the Popes, and the mode of their election, and so forth. Its author is scarcely behind M. de Rayneval in any one respect.

communion with the pope, it can never but be matter of the first necessity that Rome should belong to no one but to him. On the other hand, as long as the pope remains temporal sovereign of such extensive dominions as the states of the church, it is easy to see that the keeping up of his ecclesiastical tribunals is never likely to depend altogether upon their fees, being, in fact, part and parcel of his dignity. Hence, should Christendom in the West ever wax weary of resorting to its spiritual metropolis, it is quite certain that his government would speedily commence catering for work for it, and take energetic steps, as it has often done in time past, for reminding bishops and archbishops of their incompetency to decide points specially reserved to the Holy See.

§ 23. *Just Rights of the Pope, and of his Subjects.—General Position of the East and West.*

Should the Pope, therefore, be deprived of his temporal dominions? I reply, unhesitatingly,[121] it could only be by such defiance of all law for any foreign power or potentate to attempt or move in it as would imperil every just right and title, public or private, throughout the world. But I assert as unhesitatingly that the temporal subjects of the Pope have the same rights, in respect of their sovereign, that every other nation has, or has had ever since society commenced,

[121] I entirely concur in the view of the address signed by 268 bishops and archbishops of all parts of Europe, America, and Australia, and of the East, and presented to his Holiness Pius IX., June 9, 1862: 'We recognise the temporal power of the holy see, as a necessary and manifestly Providential institution; and we hesitate not to declare that, in the present state of human affairs, the temporal power is quite requisite for the good and free government of the church and of souls . . . What other power can be compared with it, if only in regard of its human right, on which is based the security of princes and the liberty of peoples. . . . What monarchy or commonwealth, either in ancient or modern times, can boast of rights so august and of such long prescription and of such undoubted authority? If all these should be once contemned and trampled upon, what prince can be sure of his realms, what commonwealth of its territory?' Battersby's *Cath. Directory for* 1863, pp. 255–66. Only these considerations should never lead us to look on the subjects of the states of the church as mere chattels.

besides any other rights that may have been secured to them by any laws of their own.

The long and short of it all is, that should the East ever be disposed to make terms with Rome, it must take Rome as it finds her, and as compared with its own actual state. The terms of the Council of Florence I cannot consider excessive, judged by this rule; for what was then the condition of the Greeks as compared with that of the Latins? Neither can I see that their relative conditions should warrant the Greeks in pressing for more favourable terms now. Had Peter the Great never suppressed the patriarchate of Moscow, the spiritual head of the Church of all the Russias in the nineteenth century would certainly have been a far more important personage to deal with than the patriarch of Constantinople, even in its palmiest days.

That office was abolished actually with full consent of the East; and yet, as late as A. D. 1848, we have answers from the East to a letter of the present pope,[122] in which the very same relative positions are asserted for Rome and Constantinople that existed when both pope and patriarch were subjects of one master—the master of the known world—when Rome had all the air of a deserted and used-up capital, and Constantinople all the prestige of imperial favour and preference. The 'lack-land' patriarchs of the East, who purchase their elevation for a sum of money from a sovereign not even Christian, cannot get over their objections to that form of church-government which the archbishops of Paris, Vienna, and New York continue to regard deliberately both as their rallying-point and boast. Nobody but one of these Greeks can fail to perceive that as long as Rome continues to be the seat of a prince-bishop, it will have and maintain its tribunals, its congregations, its world-encircling agencies, and insist on carrying on the work of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in all lands. Should the pope ever be shorn of his temporalities, all these must suffer diminution for want of revenues; should he cease to be master of Rome, they would become extinct, except so

[122] See the *Christian Remembrancer* for July 1851, which gives some account of them.

far, possibly, as might subserve him as arbiter of Christendom, a character ascribed to him by the whole church, East and West, long before he became a temporal prince. Then, and not before, unless Providence should have ordained otherwise—whether by some extraordinary concession on his part, or by some extraordinary combination on the part of both Protestant and Greek churches, offering reunion with him on the same terms, or else through some hidden instrumentality that we cannot predict—then, and not before, may we expect to see, in the ordinary course of events, a general return to primitive practice, and Rome sinking back gradually to the level of her ancient prerogatives of first place in the legislative, and of last appeal in the executive, government of the church. I am by no means, indeed, asserting that such a state of things would be any improvement for the times in which we live, without corresponding changes elsewhere.

§ 24. *Third Cause.—Addition to the Creed—simultaneous with its public Use.*

But for the two causes, which have been discussed hitherto, who can maintain seriously that East and West must have been rent asunder by that other question affecting doctrine, on which so much stress has been laid on both sides—it may well be thought, far more for the sake of drawing off attention from underlying facts, than from any true sense of its own importance? It had been in agitation for centuries, at all events, before the schism took place. It was from the first a twofold question, and in neither point of view has it ever had justice done to it. There is, 1. The addition to the creed of those words 'Filioque.' There is, 2. The doctrine implied in those words of the double procession of the Holy Ghost.

On the addition to the Creed, as it is called, great misconception prevails. What creed? And under what circumstances? Why is it said 'the' creed, as if there had never been but one? Let me state, by way of preface to the subject of creeds in general, that historically it would be much more appropriate to call them confessions of heresy

than of faith. 'By the law is the knowledge of sin,' says S. Paul; by creeds is the knowledge of heresy, says the ecclesiastical historian. Everybody knows that the first creed framed by the church in council was in the nature of a protest against Arius. Germs of a rule of faith there had been antecedently, both in East and West; indeed, it seems highly probable that in the Nicene creed has been preserved that form previously current in the East; that of the West, in that of the Apostles. But, as they stand, the alterations or additions in both have been considerable. The difference between the Niceno-Constantinopolitan, or the one now in use, and the Nicene Creed, consists in four omissions, and as many as thirteen additions on the part of the former,[123] all of them, indeed, introduced by authority of the second, and confirmed by authority of the third General Council; yet, for that very reason, incomparably more the work of the Eastern than of the Western church. Between the old Western creed, and that of the Apostles in its present shape, the difference is held to consist in the addition of three articles—that of the descent of our Lord into hell, that of the Holy Catholic Church, and that of the Communion of Saints—unknown to the former. It is not stated—perhaps it cannot be discovered—when, or by whose authority, these articles were appended to it. What is known is that the creed called that of the Apostles was never adopted by the East, in any shape,[124] modern or ancient, public or private; whereas the creed of the East—the Nicene, possibly, first; the Niceno-Constantinopolitan subsequently—was by degrees incorporated into every Western Liturgy. Still, in point of fact, the cause was the same, and but gradual in its effects, whether in East or West, that led to their public use. 'Peter the Fuller,' says Bingham, 'who was bishop of Antioch about A. D. 471, was the first that ordered the creed to be repeated in that church *ἐν πάσῃ συνάξει*'—celebration of the Lord's Supper, I take it, rather than 'church-assembly.' He was founder of the sect called 'Theopaschites.' 'Timotheus,

[123] Suicer, *Symb. Nic.* c. i. ad f.

[124] Voss, *De trib. Symb.* §§ 24, 46, *et seq.*

bishop of Constantinople, A. D. 511,' continues Bingham, 'was the first that brought in this custom into that church, which he did in hatred to his predecessor Macedonius, with intent to represent him as disaffected to the Nicene Creed.' Till then, it had never been recited in that church but upon Maundy-Thursday in each year.[125] 'From the oriental churches, the custom was brought into the West: first in Spain and Gallicia,[126] at the petition of king Reccaredus, by order of the third Council of Toledo, about A.D. 589, when, those churches being newly recovered from the inundation of the Arian heresy, this practice was then thought a proper antidote to preserve them from relapsing into their ancient error.' Durantus[127] and Gavanti[128] are both of opinion that the Apostles' Creed used to be recited during mass in the Roman church, but they produce no very conclusive testimony for their statement. It is not found in the Sacramentaries of either Gelasius or S. Gregory.[129] Durantus adds, on the authority of Berno, a writer of the eleventh century, that S. Mark, who was pope in A.D. 336, ordered the creed of Nicæa to be substituted for it, on account of the Arian heresy. Then Rupert is quoted as saying that Pope Damasus ordered the use of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed at mass upon certain high festivals, thirty-eight in all. All this, however, is incompatible with the counsel given by Leo III. to the churches of France, in the following words:[130] 'Let the custom of singing that creed cease in the palace, since it is not sung in our holy church, and thus it will follow that . . . what is given up by you will be given up by all.' In short, all seem agreed that it was Benedict VIII., about A.D. 1014, who first ordered its recital to form part of the mass. 'The reason why it had not been recited there previously,' says Gavanti,[131] 'and Berno says he had it from the Romans themselves, was, that the church of Rome had never been infected with

[125] Bingham, *Antiq.* b. x. c. iv. § 17; Suicer, *ibid.* c. i. § 4.
[126] Bingham, *ibid.*
[127] *De Rit.* ii. c. 24.
[128] Thesaur. *S. Rit.* pars i. tit. xi.
[129] S. Greg. *Op.* vol. iii. p. 562, note 965 of the Ben. Ed.; also Bona *Rer. Liturg.* ii. c. viii. § 3, ad f.
[130] Neale's *Eastern Ch.* vol. ii. p. 1166.
[131] Thesaur. *S. Rit.* ibid.

heresy.' Curiously enough, therefore, we find that the interpolation of it complained of by the Greeks was contemporaneous, or nearly so, with its adoption for public use by the Latins. The Greeks themselves had been some time before they introduced it into their liturgies: the first to do so had been heterodox in his tenets; the second had done so by way of protest against the heterodoxy of one of his predecessors. It held no place in the public offices of the West for between 200 and 300 years, and then, when first introduced, it was designed as a safeguard against heresy, then and there prevalent. Authentic copies of it may or may not have been plentiful under these circumstances; still, its use, and the addition made to it, seem to have been authorised simultaneously by a succession of councils held in the same metropolis, almost the most westerly of the West—Toledo. And as in Spain, so elsewhere, its use, and the addition made to it, went hand in hand; in the first instance passing into France and Germany, then prevailing in the West generally: at length, forced upon Rome in the eleventh century. 'In the words of Lupus,' says Bingham,[132] 'since the Roman church did not bring over the French and Spanish churches to her own way, she resolved at last to comply with their custom, that there might be no disagreement among them, and so the Nicene Creed (he should have said the Niceno-Constantinopolitan, and that, as interpolated in the West) came to be universally read throughout the whole church.' Let us now review our position as regards Greeks and Latins. The Latins had a creed of their own, to which they seem to have added at different times—when or how it is not easy to state—and for this they were never taken to task at all by the Greeks, as in fact the Greeks never adopted it. The Greeks had their creed likewise, which was put into definite shape by the Nicene fathers, but had no less than seventeen different alterations made in it at the Council of Constantinople, where, by the way, the West was not represented at all, and, so altered, had been adopted as final by the third

[132] *Antiq.* b. x. *ibid.*

General Council. As a rule of faith it had been forthwith accepted unanimously by East and West; but even in the East its public recital was only introduced very gradually, and as a set-off against heresy. There is great doubt whether it was ever publicly recited in any church of the West in the shape in which the third General Council had left it. Heresy first caused its introduction into public worship in the West, as in the East; but before the West adopted it formally as its own, it was interpolated, for some reason or other, by one local church—we cannot say in consequence of any fresh heresy on that subject in particular—and, as interpolated, was adopted by all the other local churches of the West in succession. Even the church of Rome, which had grappled with and overcome Western prejudices against the decrees of the second Nicene Council, had to give in to this universal instinct, that refused to be stifled, of the Latin mind, on the subject of the procession of the Holy Ghost.

I call it an instinct, because it seems to have been spontaneous in its origin, unsuggested by any heresy on that particular point of doctrine that we know of. I call it a fatal instinct, because it sought expression in the creed of the East. Had it taken the shape of a new article to the Apostles' Creed, it would probably have caused as little controversy, as that other addition of the descent of our Lord into hell. Had the descent of our Lord into hell been thrust into the creed of the East, instead of those words 'Filioque,' it is equally probable that East and West would have quarrelled—not about the procession of the Holy Ghost from Him, but about His own descent into hell. That there was therefore some strange fatality about it all is undeniable. The West could not repress its convictions; the East could not allow any change to be made in that creed which had been fixed, once for all, by one of the greatest of its œcumenical councils, still less that article to be interpolated which was couched in the very words of our Lord Himself.[133] The West had never any

[133] S. John xv. 26. 'Even the Spirit of Truth, *which proceedeth from the Father*,' &c. So that, in fact, it was Scripture itself rather than the Creed that the West had interpolated.

satisfactory reply to make to the charge of adding to that creed, or to those words. The East could never really gainsay the doctrine which that addition involved.

§ 25. *Doctrine involved in that Addition.*

Why that doctrine was of so much more intrinsic moment to the West than it was to the East, I must now gather up all my strength to explain. Its bearings have never been sounded before that I can discover, nor can they be given in a few words. They form what may be called, in some sense, 'the missing link.' By way of preface to them, let me state that I am about to draw attention to a phenomenon of the same kind with those previously noticed, as especially belonging to, if not exclusively found in, church history. No other history, whether of religions or of nations, affords any parallel to it but that of the Jews, of which it forms, so to speak, but the logical continuation. It attests a superhuman agency throughout, both in design and execution; it exhibits a perfect system of intellectual truth, worked out in strict logical sequence by successive generations, but without any collusion. Let infidels explain this coincidence if they can. It is, in effect, as though there had been a vast premeditated conspiracy handed down from father to son, to be matured and carried out; materials collected from all quarters, brought together, shaped, and arranged for the avowed purpose of building up a tower of undying truth that should reach to heaven. The would-be hinderers of that work have perhaps helped it forward most of all; and those who have been most careful to keep to the beaten track of their predecessors have been the last to divine what new turn or interpretation would be given by posterity to their own labours; irresistible evidence, on all sides, of a Divine purpose, that it is wholly beyond the best as well as the worst of men to arrest or divert from its own appointed issues.[134]

[134] 'The rôle of the thinker, like that of the statesman, seems to be provided for him by some mightier overruling than mere human agencies.

I say, therefore, that as the general work which God laid upon the collective church was to baptize and to save souls through Christ, so the special work committed by Him to the churches of East and West has been that of eliciting and interpreting revealed truth in its two great branches of theology and anthropology; not, however, in the order of nature, but of grace. Natural theology and natural anthropology did not enter into their task, as such, except so far as to form their starting-point or basis. Here Jew and Gentile had been already employed. Instinct, tradition, or the Old Testament had done the work to their hands thus far. 'The lands of the heathen' and 'the labours of the people' were to be 'taken into possession' indeed; but it was the new soil to be upturned by them which formed their own special province. Christian theology and Christian anthropology,[135] revealed Divinity, redeemed humanity—or the redeeming God, and the redeemed man—were the subjects assigned respectively to the churches of East and West to work out. I say, emphatically, assigned to them; because it can be proved from history that this has been their one consistent, yet mutually distinct and not even contemporaneous, occupation since they became churches to the present day.

All this is no less easy to substantiate than to assert, and it will involve some very curious paradoxes. In the first place, it seems strange that the East, which gave birth to Aristotle and Plato, those arch-anatomists of the natural man, should have so little to say on the subject of the redeemed man—on the action of grace upon the heart of man, on the nature and effects of the Sacraments designed to be the aliment of his spiritual life, and so forth. One might have thought, antecedently, that this would have formed the very

His ideas, and the words which convey them, fall on the minds of his generation like sparks on the tinder, and light up a flame which searches through and through existing systems and institutions; consuming the wood, the hay, and the stubble, leaving unscathed only what is of durable, because diviner, materials . . .'—Mr. Espins' *Critical Essays*, ii. p. 30.

[135] Moehler, with his usual sagacity, had noticed this incidentally; but he does not pursue the idea any further in its collective aspect.—*Symbolism*, Introd. p. 3, Robertson's translation.

first outburst of Oriental speculativeness; that it would have exhausted the topic of humanity under its new conditions, so manifold and ennobling, before it approached that of Divinity: standing, as Divinity does, confessedly last in the order of logic, as well as of the joint systems of Aristotle and Plato. Still further, one might have thought antecedently that the East would have exhausted theory on both subjects before parting with either of them, and left it only to the West to discuss their practical bearings; or, finally, who could have anticipated beforehand that these two subjects would have been so equally parcelled out between East and West as they have been, and as will be shown presently beyond dispute?

§ 26. *Plagiarisms from Africa.—S. Athanasius and S. Austin.*

Curious too is, and scarce fortuitous can be, the paradox, that in point of actual fact the churches of both East and West have been little more than plagiarists, and that any merit of originality in either case belongs to a third church, a third country, distinct from both. Egypt, or Eastern Africa, in S. Athanasius, laid down unerringly the science of what may be called Christian divinity; Algeria, or Western Africa, in the person of S. Augustine, laid down unerringly the science of what may be called Christian humanity for the universal church of all ages and lands. All that East and West have done since, in either department, has been to draw out and systematise the transcendentally magnificent, and almost mathematically exact, theories of those two most illustrious of Christian doctors; alike reverenced and appealed to in East and West, alike belonging to neither of them in point of fact. S. Athanasius may be said to have anticipated in his writings the decision of the sixth General Council that condemned the Monothelites, the last dogmatic enunciation of the assembled East on the subject of the redeeming God; S. Augustine, the decrees of the Council of Trent upon Justification, the last dogmatic enunciation of the assembled West on the subject of redeemed man. The only difference between the discharge of their respective functions is one of

time. East set about its task at once, finished it, and became lost in barbarism; West had to be lost in barbarism, and to emerge from it, before it could set about and achieve its work. But I must not anticipate.

§ 27. *Christian Theology in the East.—Few Theologians in the West.*

Let me proceed to show that Christian theology, as such, has been the work of the East. In order to do so, will it be necessary to do more than to refer to those heresies in contradistinction to which orthodox doctrine was defined? Our Lord enjoined the Sacrament of Baptism to be administered in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. What were the relations of these Divine Persons to each other, and what have They done for man?

The Council of Nicæa, by declaring the Son to be 'of one substance with the Father,' vindicated His complete Divinity against all those who had previously opposed it. The Council of Constantinople condemned alike those who had denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, as Macedonius; or, as Sabellius, any proper distinction of persons in the Godhead. The Council of Ephesus condemned Nestorius, who had asserted that there were two persons; and the Council of Calcedon condemned Eutyches, who had denied that there were two natures in the Incarnate Word. The fifth General Council found little more to do than to reiterate and confirm what had been already ruled in reference to the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Incarnation; but the sixth General Council found one more error to condemn in reference to the latter of these, that of those who would admit the existence of but one will in God-made-Man.

Here, for all purposes of fundamental doctrine, the General Councils of the East end. The West adopted and embodied all that had been laid down in them in its own Athanasian Creed, with true legal acumen. If we except the great bishop of Rome, S. Leo, there was no Western writer who can be said to have contributed in any degree to these dogmatic statements. SS. Ambrose, Hilary, and Jerome were great

theologians, but they did not originate, nor in fact assist in, the resolution of any one of the foregoing points. SS. Hilary and Jerome, moreover, drew most of their inspiration from the East, where they were long resident. S. Irenæus, the earliest of all Western opponents of heresy, was a native of Asia Minor. Tertullian, SS. Cyprian and Augustine, though they wrote in the language of the West, were Africans.

§ 28. *Early Western Instincts.—Specimens of their Manifestation.*

To the East, therefore, belongs almost exclusively the glory of having extracted from Holy Scripture, and epitomized, that sum of Christian theology which has ever since obtained and been accounted orthodoxy by the whole church. S. Athanasius himself thought and wrote as a Greek. With the single exception of the papacy, it might be added, that the whole system of gradations in church-government, culminating in general councils and patriarchs, took its rise in the East; nor would it be unfair at all to the West to affirm that, for the first six centuries or so, the scene both of the life and action of the whole church was laid in the East. Yet, even in its infancy, it is curious to observe how the West instinctively grasped at what may be called its own special questions 'in the paulo-post future,' and likewise succeeded, even then, in ruling them. Against rebaptism it ruled in the very teeth of the Africans, and of a great part of the East. The keeping of Easter it ruled against the Quartodecimans, and with so much acknowledged superiority, that the bishop of Alexandria was ordered by the Nicene fathers to make a formal report every year, to the Roman see, of the exact day on which Easter would fall, according to the calculation of his astronomers. Against the expressed sentiments of the Nicene fathers, it commenced legislating, before the fourth century had closed, upon clerical celibacy. Pelagius scarce made a convert, scarce encountered an antagonist in the East. The West claimed the exclusive task of refuting his tenets, where alone, in fact, they were taken up. The third General Council condemned Celestius far more as a partisan of Nes-

torius than as a disseminator of Pelagianism.[136] In short, Pelagianism was altogether the case of a heresy 'born out of due time;' and S. Augustine wrote far more for generations as yet in embryo than for his own.

§ 29. *Creed interpolated by the West as it commenced its Work.—The Double Procession its Motto.*

For there was a long lifeless interval of many centuries elapsing between the completion of its task by the East, and the entrance of the West in earnest upon its own appointed mission. The Eastern mind had been literally used up in combating all those theological heresies with which for upwards of three centuries all its fathers and councils had been hotly engaged. But it had to sink from sheer exhaustion before it would resign its lead in the torch-race to the resuscitated and onward-impelled West. Now it was precisely *during this interval* that the West adopted the creed of the East as its own, by formally inserting it into its public liturgies, but interpolated with a single new profession of its own. About to become actively militant, it would be known by its own badge, its own motto. That motto was the double procession of the Holy Ghost. Why so? For this simple reason, that it was, in fact, the corner-stone of Christian anthropology. Did Christ merely redeem man by dying upon the Cross once for all, or was the communication of the benefits of His Incarnation to all men, in every age, His own work likewise? Was it the Spirit of Christ that was working in the hearts of His regenerate people, or was the gift of the Holy Ghost not Christ's to give? This was a point of cardinal importance, both in its retrospective and prospective bearings.[137] It must have reopened the question of the

[136] Can. 1 and 4.

[137] This is excellently expressed—though without any reference to the dispute between Greeks and Latins—in one of the most profound of modern dogmatic treatises, as follows: 'That it should be the office of the Holy Ghost to unite men in this manner to the Humanity of Christ, is the result, therefore, of His cooperating in that mediatorial function which the Eternal Son became Incarnate to undertake. To regard the actings of the Holy Ghost as directed into any other channel, would be to suppose that there was some other name than that

Divinity of our Lord, it must have halved the obligations of man to Him, could it ever have been taught and maintained that His mediatorial office terminated with His Ascension, and that the Holy Ghost had been sent by the Father to carry out, apply, and complete that work which the Son had only achieved in its objective parts. It was absolutely necessary for the West to start with a right apprehension and unequivocal assertion of this fundamental truth. Nobody doubted but that the Holy Ghost operated upon the souls of believers, in, and apart from, the Sacraments; or that He had been sent by the Father. The question was, Had He been sent by the Son likewise? This question, could it have been simply put, must have been answered by the whole Christian world with one consent in the affirmative. But the Greeks, ever sensitive where the integrity of their creeds and canons was concerned, ever instinctively carried off into the regions of pure theology, saw directly that there was another and a still deeper question involved in it; namely, the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost, as distinct from what was afterwards called His temporal mission.[138] But had not the former of these two questions been long since settled, both

of Christ given under heaven, whereby we might be saved. Its real tendency would be to substitute the Holy Ghost in place of the Son; or rather to maintain, that whereas the work of men's government and salvation was at one time discharged by God under the name of Christ, at a later period there was a new title adopted, and the same Being reappeared under the name of the Holy Ghost. And thus we should be led back into the same system of Sabellianism which has been before exhibited . . . .' — Wilberforce on the Incarnation, c. x. p. 292–3.

[138] See S. Thom. *Summæ Theol.* part i. q. 43. Compare the letter of S. Maximus to Marinus, presbyter of Cyprus, written from Rome about the middle of the seventh century. The sum and substance of his meaning appears to be, that 'to proceed *from* the Son' is merely another way of expressing 'to proceed *through* the Son' (*Op.* vol. ii. p. 69, *et seq.*; and *Combef.* ad l. Paris 1675), as John Veccus (*Orat.* ii. t. 2, *Græciæ Orthodoxæ*, p. 63, *et seq.*) interprets him. 'Ὑμῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἀγαπητὸν τῷ μεγάλῳ Μαξίμῳ κατακολουθεῖν ὑπερηγοροῦντι Ῥωμαίων, ἐφ' οἷς καὶ τότε ἐκ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἔλεγεν ἐκπορεύεσθαι, καὶ οὐδὲν διαφέρειν τὸ ἐκ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ, πρὸς τὸ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν, ἐκδιδάσκοντι—δι' ὧν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ τὸ ἐκ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι, εἰς τὸ δι' Υ οὗ προίεναι, σαφῶς ἐκλαμβάνεται . . .' The confession of the Latin faith sent by Pope Gregory to Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, contains similar doctrine.

by the language of Scripture and that of their own creed? From their own transcendental point of view there could be little doubt but that it had; accordingly, it was upon the former of these two questions that East and West joined issue; yet, curiously enough, as I have before observed, the more accurately we analyse their points of contact and divergence thereupon, the more certainly do we obtain possession of the missing link or clue to their respective missions. The East, with its gaze fixed upon the Godhead, in Its triplicity of Persons, coeternal and coequal, Their relations and order of precedence amongst Themselves, held intuitively to the idea that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father alone,[139] a proposition which was perfectly true in the order of nature; nor could it be denied, by the Latins, but that His eternal procession from the Son had come to the latter by gift.[140] The West, with its gaze fixed upon the Godhead in Its relations to redeemed man, argued on behalf of the double procession; but, when called upon for scriptural proofs of it, they took their stand upon the undoubted fact that, in connection with the scheme of redemption, the Holy Ghost is spoken of in Holy Writ as belonging to, given, and sent by the Son.[141]

[139] 'The explanation of S. Maximus, of the Latin doctrine, was: that the Latins, by affirming that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, do not pretend that the Son was the cause of the Spirit; and they know very well that the Father is the sole cause of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; of the Son by generation, of the Holy Ghost by procession .... And the Latins themselves affirmed at the Council of Florence, "We assert and believe that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son as one sole principle, and by one sole production."' —Dupin's *Eccl. Hist.* cent. xiv. c. 3, Eng. Tr.

[140] Estius in *Sent.* lib. i. dist. xii. § 3. 'Principaliter Spiritus Sanctus a solo Patre procedit, quia licèt Pater et Filius sint ambo Spiritûs Sancti principium, solus tamen Pater est principium sine principio: Filius autem principium ex principio. Item propriè Spiritus Sanctus a Patre procedit, quia Pater ab alio non accipit ut ex Ipso procedat Spiritus Sanctus; Filius autem hoc accipit a Patre . . .'

[141] See the passages enumerated, *Ibid.* dist. xi. § 1. S. Anselm's treatise, *De Processione Sp. S.*, is by far the ablest on the Latin side. Its argumentative part is done full justice to by Mr. Palmer in his masterly c. x. on the subject, in *Dissertations on the Orthodox Communion.* By way of specimen, in reply to the argument of the Greeks that the Holy Ghost is *more* from the Father than the Son, because proceeding from the latter by gift of the former, S. Anselm urges with great force that the Father is not

The Greeks had already shown 'the union of Godhead with Manhood in Christ to be a real, perfect, and lasting union.' It became the business of the Latins to apply themselves to the elucidation of 'its appointed effect, the union of Christ with men.'[142] The Greeks had taught how Christ had been conceived by the Holy Ghost when He was made Man; the Latins had to teach how men were made members of Christ in every age, partakers of His Humanity and Divinity, through the same Spirit. The Eternal Son was the actor, the Eternal Spirit His instrument in either case.

§ 30. *Western Plagiarisms and Originalities.—Application of the Incarnation to Man.*

It will be shown, in its proper place, to what extent, subsequently to the Council of Trent, the East has synodically adopted Western ideas and Western language on various points essentially bound up with Christian anthropology. But the West, with that vigour and comprehensiveness which distinguishes it, has been far more of a plagiarist from the East, by incorporating into its own system, with its own striking additions and interpretations, all that was worth borrowing from the East, Pagan as well as Christian. It was not that theology was not to enter at all into Western enquiries and elucubrations; far otherwise. But what the West really did in that department was to systematise, to put into logical shape, to draw logical deductions from those sublime truths which Easterns had, with subtler, more concentrated, and more piercing gaze, discovered in the starry firmament of the Word of God. It did not seek to add to them. It invented nothing absolutely new of its own. It took the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Incarnation as S. Athanasius and other great Eastern luminaries had thought them out, drawing consequences from them, indeed, at once bold and

more God than the Son, though the Son owes his existence to the Father. But when S. Anselm comes to quote Scripture, it is very doubtful whether he can prove more than temporal mission from the Son.

[142] I willingly borrow these felicitous expressions from *The Doctrine of the Incarnation*, already cited, p. 325.

original,[143] and arraying them in philosophical form and language. But it addressed itself in a kindred spirit of originality to questions which no Eastern mind had ever aspired to investigate in their full length and breadth. It assumed, for its own special province, to enquire into the precise way in which the benefits of the Incarnation were brought home to men; how the merits of Christ were appropriated by each one of us in this life, and through what channels saving grace was conveyed. To elucidate, and then unfold, what has been well called the Sacramental System;[144] yet to show that God has by no means restricted the outpourings of His grace to the Sacraments themselves.[145] To point out the distinctive character of each one of those Sacraments; the wider and indefinitely more-thrown-open ordinance of Baptism; the closer and more esoteric ordinance of the blessed Eucharist; the

[143] E. g. the dogma 'Inseparabilia esse Trinitatis opera . . . id est, quæcunque Deus ad extra operatur.' *Estius ad Sent.* lib. i. dist. 20, § 3, the full expression of which is to be found in S. Aug. *Serm.* LII., *De verbis Evang. Matt.* iii. Ed. Ben. § 5, and still more in *Serm. XXXVIII.* (in append.), 'De Trinitate et Columbâ.' Still more bold is the dogma 'Spiritus Sanctus non ab æterno principium est, sed esse cœpit, quia non dicitur principium nisi ad creaturas' . . . Peter Lombard, *Sent.* lib. i. dist. xxix., and *Estius*, ad l.

[144] 'If man had never fallen, to inherit the nature of the first Adam had been a sufficient means of communion with God. But because the natural means of communication have been cut off, that supernatural union is requisite, which we obtain by participating the nature of the second Adam. Now it is for the diffusion of this renewed and renewing manhood that those media have been provided, whereby the Son of Man communicates Himself to His brethren. All the ordinances of the Church, its hallowed things, places, and persons, its worship and sacraments, are a series of instruments whereby the sanctified Manhood of the Mediator diffuses itself as a life-giving seed through the mass of humanity.' *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, c. xi. p. 327.

[145] Peter Lombard, *Sent.* lib. iv. dist. i. § 4. 'Quibus non alligavit potentiam suam Deus. Comp. dist. iv. § 5, circa med. and S. Thomas on each of them. On the first he says, q. 2, art. 6: 'Quantùm ad adultos in lege naturæ sufficiebat sola fides; cùm etiam modò sufficiat ei, qui non ex contemptu sacramenta dimittit.' On the second, q. 3, art. 3: 'Articulus necessitatis sacramentum excludit.' Akin to this, in more modern times, was the condemnation by Clement XI., as heretical, of that proposition of Quesnel (on S. Luke x. 35, 36), 'nulla extra ecclesiam conceditur gratia,' the 29th of those 101 propositions condemned in the Bull 'Unigenitus.' See Mr. Buckley's *Translation of the Canons and Decrees of Trent*, p. 350.

power of the keys; the graces and gifts of the Holy Ghost in each of these, and in the rest; His internal workings in the individual Christian, and in the collective Church. In one word, as it may be said to have been the business of the East to dogmatise upon the Person of Christ, so it may be said to have been the business of the West to dogmatise upon the Church, His mystical Body; and that not merely in her office of guardian and dispenser of the Sacraments, but in her other and more comprehensive province of remodeller and regenerator of society, in all its manifold relations throughout the world, by means of the principle of new life derived from Him. Christian ethics, and Christian politics; the systems of Aristotle and Plato, purified from error and harmonised with the Gospel; original sin; the supernatural virtues of faith, hope, and charity; the moral virtues in what may be called their revised code; the duties of one Christian nation to another; of Christians to their fellow-men; states and conditions of all men in every Christian community; slavery, marriage, celibacy; the relations of Church and State; of the clergy to the temporal power; the duties of rulers to their subjects, of subjects to their rulers; the claims of authority, the rights of private judgment, religious tolerance and intolerance; the provinces of faith and reason; the notes of the Church; the evidences of Christianity; the authenticity of the Scriptures—all these are questions which Western Christendom has plunged into, sooner or later, instinctively, as falling within its own appointed sphere, as needing to be discussed or revised; to be decided, once for all, or to be left open questions; and has pronounced upon, in some shape or other, whether by its authoritative organs in formal decrees, or else by public opinion, gradually, but surely, making itself heard and felt. Sometimes there has been a conflict of protracted duration between these two final appeals, and the issue has been left doubtful for centuries, and at length settled by compromise, as was the case with investitures. Sometimes public opinion has overborne authority, as when the creed, as interpolated in Spain and France, was forced upon Rome; sometimes authority has overborne public opinion, as when

the decrees of the Synod of Frankfort were overruled by Rome; sometimes authority and public opinion have gone together by acclamation, as when the 'treuga,' or truce of God, was proclaimed. Who can deny but that it is to Western intellects and Western energy that the thanks of the world are due for the solution of most of these questions—for the practical or argumentative discussion of them all—in that new aspect which they assumed on blending with the faith of Christ?[146] There is not one of them on which any Easterns have so written as to be considered original authorities. On the other hand, what question of high Christian theology is there, on which the teaching of the East has not been received?

§ 31. *Specimens of Greek Treatises.—S. Cyril and S. John Damascene.*

We may illustrate what is advanced a little more fully by tracing the character of what may be called their respective 'symbolisms'[147] in some of their principal writers and councils. For instance: S. Cyril's 'Catechetical Lectures,' and the 'Orthodox Faith' of S. John Damascene, may be taken as specimens of the dogmatic teaching of the East, budding and fullblown. Now, on what points do they treat? S. Cyril's are little more than plain homilies on sin, on baptism, on the principal heads of Christian doctrine, on each of the articles of the old Creed of Jerusalem and some of the heresies opposed to it, on the duties of baptized Christians, on the Lord's Supper, and on the Lord's Prayer. This is his body of Christian doctrine. There is much piety, yet but little method or argument about them all. They are just what primitive Christians of ordinary capacity might be supposed to have listened to with attention and profit. S. John Damascene is much more terse and argumentative. On the

[146] Here let me refer generally to such works as M. Guizot's *Hist. of Civilisation*, Hazlitt's *Tr.*, and the late Professor Ozanam's *Civilisation au 5^me^ Siècle*, a work that would equally repay translation.

[147] On the use of this word see Mr. Robertson's *Introductory Notice*, p. vi., to his translation of Moehler's *Symbolism*.

Godhead, which forms the subject of his first book, he is intellectual and profound; in his second book, while treating of created elements and intelligences, he shows that he has studied the different schools of philosophy of ancient Greece side by side with the Old Testament, and with the Fathers, who have expounded it. The chapters on man, his parts and passions, on freewill and providence, foreknowledge and predestination, are still worth our careful perusal; but it is on the Incarnation, which is treated of throughout the whole third, and part of the fourth book, that he rises to the full height of a master, and is not to be outshone by any future seraphic or angelic doctor amongst Latins, and exhibits Greek theology in its most striking aspect. How marked, by comparison, his brevity, when treating of faith and baptism, of the Saints, and of Holy Scripture, as if they were subjects that did not belong to him. If he is more eloquent upon the Holy Eucharist, it is because it brings him back to the Incarnation. In short, he cannot abstain from plunging into theology again more than once, before he brings his fourth book to a close, in defiance of all method.

§ 32. *Latin Treatises.—The Book of the 'Sentences.'—The great Work of S. Thomas.*

Turn straight from these to the four books of the 'Sentences' of Peter Lombard, and the 'Theological Sum' of S. Thomas Aquinas, and we get into another world directly. Peter Lombard has evidently borrowed the idea of his work from S. John Damascene; but in point of arrangement he is much more logical, and even in theological details more full. There is more of revealed and less of natural theology, in his first book, than in that of S. John; while that of S. John is also very much shorter than his. In his second book, avoiding all those mere physical, astronomical, and even geographical speculations into which S. John has diverged at great length, and only treating of the Scriptural account of the creation very compendiously, he becomes copious and enquiring at once on reaching his own proper province, man. How man was created; how he became a living soul; how woman was formed out of his side;

their state before and after the fall; original righteousness and original sin; grace and concupiscence; freewill and actual sin; its causes, its punishments; the seven principal sins. All these take the place of those discussions upon pain and pleasure; the passions and the senses; imagination, thought, and memory; moral actions and their constituents, which occur in S. John as belonging to the natural man, almost as we find them treated in Aristotle, and quite independently of the fall—of its disastrous effects or cure. Then, instead of a book and a half upon the Incarnation, Peter has contrived to do justice to that august subject in the first half of his third book; yet, with true practical instinct, he retains it steadily in view whilst apportioning the subject-matter of faith, hope, and charity, those supernatural virtues which come to us through Christ alone; of those moral virtues into which He has infused new life; of the seven gifts of that Spirit which He has shed abroad in our hearts; and of the Ten Commandments, which He has supplied us with power to keep. There is scarcely a word upon all this in S. John Damascene. Finally, in devoting the greater part of his fourth book to the general consideration of the Sacraments, and of each one of them in particular, he may claim the credit of having attracted the thoughts of SS. Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure, of Albert the Great and Dun Scotus, of Richard Middleton, Ægidius, Durandus, Alanus, and others, his gigantic commentators, to a field where literally no Greek had ever trod; to a field destined, in their hands, and through their industry, to yield a magnificent harvest of thought on the subject of mankind Christianised, and prepared for heaven, by a series of Divinely-appointed means. Let any one disposed to doubt this only turn to what is called the 'Secunda Secundæ' of S. Thomas Aquinas—that work to which one of the greatest of English divines and casuists did not hesitate to refer as a principal source of all his acquirements.[148] It is,

[148] He 'said they were chiefly three: Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Aquinas' *Secunda Secundæ*, and *Tully*, but chiefly his offices.' Walton's *Life of Sanderson*, ad f.

indeed, a mirror of Christian life in all its complex relations, of the duties which are required of us all in our several callings, and of the obstacles which beset our paths. Happiness in the abstract, virtue and vice resolved into their component elements, had been discussed in the first portion of the second part; here they are discussed as they are found in men of every sort and grade. Look at the fulness with which each particular question is handled; look at the exquisite method with which each question comes up for investigation just where it ought, and how it paves the way for what follows. Examine the sacramental system of Part III. Reflect how beautifully the Incarnation stands at the head of it, as being the one thing designed to be perpetuated and applied through the Sacraments. Then pause to survey the whole colossal work in all its parts—four closely-printed folios,[149] and yet unfinished; a fate common to most of the gorgeous architectural piles of the middle ages, its contemporaries—yet, even so, furnishing life-long occupation to men of the intellectual grasp of Vasquez and Suarez to comment upon it; and shall we not recognise in it one of the grandest pictures of man in his state of grace ever achieved by man? one to which Western Christendom can never cease to look back with just pride, as being, in a peculiar sense, its own; as one of the vastest and most imperishable monuments ever reared to truth on the deepest of all earthly subjects.

And may I not assert, too, that Dante, Giotto, and Michael-Angelo, with their respective schools, drew their inspiration, at least in its ultimate sources, from this great work of S. Thomas? Undoubtedly it supplied them with their ideal —with their working drawings—though it was itself no more than the perfect expression and setting forth of a great subjective fact. In point of originality, beyond dispute, the parentage of art, poetry, and philosophy belonged to the East; but when the time came for them to be baptized, the East seemed to have parted with all control over them, and the West assumed their exclusive sponsorship and Christian

[149] Ed. Abbé Migne.

training. Christianity did for them all, when they had reached maturity, what Ocean had been held to do by Homer for the autumnal planet:

ὅς τε μάλιστα
Λαμπρὸν παμφαίνῃσι λελουμένος Ὠκεανοῖο.

All that was high and chivalrous, heroic and self-denying, artistic and intellectual, in the middle ages, owed its origin to the union of the Human with the Divine, accomplished by our Lord, perpetuated in His Church. S. Thomas, of all men, had expressed this in adequate words; his contemporaries and their successors thought and worked by the light of his teaching.

§ 33. *Councils of East and West.—Digests of their Canons contrasted.*

But again we may illustrate what has been done by East and West from their respective councils. What is, in the first place, the kind of literature to which they have given rise? We may fairly take, as specimens of ecclesiastical jurisprudence on the part of the Greeks, the 'Nomocanon' of Photius, and the code of the Greek church interpreted by the joint labours of Theodore Balsamon, John Zonaras, and Alexius Aristeas. Now, the former of these is a kind of digest of imperial laws and ecclesiastical canons for the regulation of Church discipline. Photius, with all his learning, cannot swell his subject beyond the limits of a very moderate folio; and, but for the very learned and diffuse notes of the English Bishop Beveridge, the united commentaries of Balsamon, Zonaras, and Aristeas would only form another, perhaps a trifle more bulky. Place side by side with these two moderate volumes the 'Decretum' of Gratian, the Decretals in all their parts, and but a tithe of what has been written upon both. Their comparison can serve but to provoke a smile. Whatever objections some persons may have to the old Canon Law, there can be no denying its vast grasp of materials, and logical perfection in their arrangement. The Greeks have nothing whatever to set against it of an ecclesiastical character:

its only true rivals are the Pandects and Code of Justinian; but, surely, the glory of these belongs to the empire, not the church—to the West more than the East.[150] Again, who could think of comparing the canons and acts of those councils forming the code of the Greek Church as settled in the Trullan Synod of A.D. 683, and as exhibited by Bishop Beveridge,[151] with the canons and acts of those councils of Italy, Spain, France, Great Britain, Germany, which fill so many ponderous tomes, and bear largely upon almost every social question contemporaneous with them in church and state? Who can fail to be struck with the difference of subject-matter between the one and the other, even where both affect to be legislating upon church discipline? I shall perhaps best explain what I mean by dwelling upon some of the most remarkable points of contrast between the general councils of East and West.[152]

§ 34. *Subject-matter of Eastern Canons.*

Looking then at the subject of church-discipline from the point of view in which it is set forth in the Nicene, Constantinopolitan, Ephesine, and Chalcedonian canons, we cannot fail to perceive what a very narrow range it embraces. Privileges of metropolitans and patriarchs, meetings of provincial synods, dealings with the heretics of those days, general regulations for the clergy—these are the heads treated of; in the Quini-sext or Trullan canons, besides the foregoing, which are all reiterated, we find some few that are ceremonial, and some few relating to life and manners in the world; straggling protests, in general, against Western usages; or confirmations, incidentally, of some older canons. The last, or 102nd, alone glances at a subject—that of penance—on which doubtless the ante-Nicene fathers in East and West had legislated

[150] I say this because of the Novels principally, which are of Eastern origin and ecclesiastic bearings.

[151] Or more compendiously in Johnson's *Vade Mecum*, whose Preface affords some useful information. See vol. ii.

[152] For what follows, see generally Catalani *Concil. Œcum.* tom. i.–iv.

more extensively and systematically than upon any other; but here again, curiously enough, both the initiative and final completion of that code belongs to the West, as will be shown in its proper place.

The special attention bestowed on the creed is the characteristic of all Eastern Councils. Niçæa, Constantinople, Ephesus outdid each other in its settlement; even in the Trullan and Second Nicene Councils, it comes up for recapitulation and confirmation before anything else is taken in hand.

§ 35. *Topics handled in Western Councils.—Creed and Canons of Innocent III.*

Look at the difference in the West: there is no sort of allusion to it in the canons of the 1st Lateran, or 9th General Council, in A.D. 1123; of the 2nd Lateran, or 10th General, in A.D. 1139; of the 3rd Lateran, or 11th General, in A.D. 1179. Discipline, in its widest sense, beginning with simoniacal ordinations and lay-investitures, is their avowed work. Canon XXIII. of the second of these is, significantly enough, directed against Peter de Bruis, Arnold of Brescia, and others, who maligned the sacraments. I shall have a good deal to say on these heresies presently. Then the 'truce of God,' as it is called, is published under pain of excommunication. Christians are forbidden to supply Saracens with any commodities, especially munitions of war: those who do so may be made slaves. Wreckers and pirates are excommunicated. Usurers are to be denied communion, and, if they die impenitent, the rites of Christian sepulture. Christians are not allowed to be servants of Jews or Saracens, or even to live with them. Heretics and their abettors are not merely anathematised, but their goods may be confiscated, and themselves made slaves. Those who take up arms against them are to be let off all penance for two years; those who refuse to do so are to be excluded from communion. Milder measures might have failed, where the taming of so many savage natures had to be achieved. Christendom had to fight its way in the West against feudalism and lawlessness, and in doing so to deal some hard blows. Its assertions of moral

power needed to be both absolute and unwavering to be effective. It rose more and more loftily to its work at each successive stage, till it gave laws to mind as well as matter in the same breath. It commenced with a discipline of its own; it speedily put forth a creed of its own. The absence of any creed from the three Lateran Councils of the twelfth century is not more conspicuous than the promulgation of a creed—autocratic, original, and independent—by the lordly president of the 4th Lateran Council, in A.D. 1215, at the head of those seventy canons alike stamped with the impress of his master-spirit, appealing to no councils of the East for its confirmation, nor taking any creed of the East for its model.

It would not have been Western, if in its theological portion had not been included the double Procession of the Holy Ghost; but these are parts of the creed equally:—1. The existence of good and bad angels. 2. 'Una est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur.' 3. Transubstantiation of the elements in the Holy Eucharist. 4. Necessity of a priest to consecrate them. 5. The validity of baptism by whomsoever administered in due form. 6. The remission of post-baptismal sin through true penance. 7. Heaven attainable by all, married and celibate alike, through right faith and good works.

Of the other canons—for the creed itself is couched in the form of a canon—the 21st has proved to be the all-important one. It enjoins the faithful of both sexes and mature age to make their confession once a year to their own priest, and communion at Easter at least. Its pendant is to be found in the 13th Session of the Council of Constance, where communion is ordered to be given to laymen only when fasting, and in one kind. With this single exception, the doctrine and discipline of the West may be said to have been complete from the passing of these Lateran Canons to the Council of Trent—from the Creed of Innocent to the Creed of Pius. What schoolmen, canonists, and councils did in the interim was, in fact, in the way of complement: by either elucidating, expanding, or building upon them. The double Procession was more fully set forth and vindicated at the 2nd

Council of Lyons, and at the Council of Florence. The doctrine of Transubstantiation derived immense support from the observance of the festival of 'Corpus Christi,' which the Council of Vienne enjoined. The heresies condemned in the 3rd and 4th Lateran Councils recur, and are condemned again and again by succeeding councils. The princes of Europe are stirred up again and again to draw the sword against heretics and infidels, as so many social pests. Baldwin II., the Latin emperor of Constantinople, was present at the 1st Council of Lyons, in A.D. 1245, and heard Frederic II. solemnly deposed. The Emperor Sigismund, who was present at the Council of Constance, in A.D. 1414, heard three popes deposed: and one, who was neither priest nor bishop,[153] elected unanimously to the highest post in the Church—a grand moral lesson to all earthly potentates in either case, the benefits of which are still felt.

§ 36. *Penitential System due to the West.—Originated by Novatianism.*

Before attempting to define the exact relation of the Council of Trent to those of the West which preceded it, I think some glimmerings of light will be thrown upon it by briefly considering what may be called Western or Mediæval heresies, inasmuch as heresies and dogmatism mutually react upon each other; and in doing so, I propose starting from a subject which has been already touched upon incidentally—or the Penitential System. Because there are Greek as well as Latin terms for the stations of 'mourners, hearers, prostrate, and bystanders,' it is apt to be concluded that these distinctions are of Eastern origin, and that the whole system which is implied by them passed from East to West, rather than the converse. That it had been in vogue there some time before the Nicene Council is clear from several canons

[153] 'Otton Colonne . . . qui prit le nom de Martin V. . . . . on voyait ensuite le Pape, monté sur un cheval blanc caparaçonné d'écarlate: il était revêtu des habits pontificans, avec la mitre en tête, quoiqu'il ne fût encore ni prêtre, ni évêque. . . . Le lendemain il fut ordonné diacre, le jour suivant prêtre, et le troisième jour évêque.' Rohrbacker, *E. H.* vol. xxi. pp. 169, 170.

of that council, and from the Canons of Ancyra and Neocæsarea, passed some ten years previously. It is still more fully brought out in the Canons of S. Gregory Thaumaturgus and of S. Basil.[154] The question is, when and where did it originate? And I think the answer must be, with the schism of Novatus and Novatian at Carthage, or more strictly Rome. Then it was that the question of post-baptismal sin came up for the first time, and that penance began to be recognised as 'the second plank for shipwrecked man.'[155] 'Velit, nolit, Novatius hæreticus, omni tempore Dei gratia recipit pœnitentes,' says the author of the treatise 'De Cœna Domini.'[156] This was the principle on which it reposed: but it was at Rome, not Carthage, that Novatus in reality established his sect, and gave effect to his opinions, by forming a coalition there with Novatian, and procuring his own consecration by three Italian bishops, a very full account of all which was furnished by Cornelius to Fabius bishop of Antioch, and so became known in the East.[157] Let us hear now from Socrates and Sozomen in what way their errors were met, and where principally. Socrates, himself charged with Novatianism, says: 'Upon the separation of Novatus and his party from the Church, because they were unwilling to hold communion with such as had lapsed in the Decian persecution, from that period of time the bishops had added to the ecclesiastical roll a presbyter, whose peculiar office it should be to manage the concerns of penitents, who, having fallen into sin after baptism, were thenceforward to confess their crimes to the presbyter so appointed.'

'As to the Novatians,' proceeds Sozomen, 'they indeed,

[154] Can. II. of the first; and the third Canonical Epistle to Amphilochius of the second. See Johnson's *Vade Mecum*, vol. ii. pp. 222 and 242–46.

[155] 'Secunda tabula post naufragium,' *V. Estium in Sent.* lib. iv. dist. xiv. § 1, and *Concil. Trid.* sess. vi. c. 14.

[156] Formerly attributed to S. Cyprian, being the sixth of a collection of tracts, *De Operibus Christi cardinalibus*; now supposed to have been the work of a friend and contemporary of S. Bernard: Arnold, abbot of Bona Vallis, in the diocese of Chartres. (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* s. v.) If so, it points to a revival of *Novatian* errors in the twelfth century.

[157] Euseb. *E. H.* vi. 43, and S. Cypr. *Ep.* xlix. That their names should have been confused is natural enough.

making no account of the penitential discipline, could have no occasion either for this office itself, or for the officer entrusted with it; but all other sects retain them both to this day. The Western Churches, and especially the Roman, have them in frequent use, and in great esteem: for *there* a public station is appointed for penitents, where they stand under great appearances of sorrow, and when so much of the Liturgy is finished, as to the dismission of the catechumens, without partaking of the holy mysteries with the faithful, they, the penitents, prostrate themselves with sighs and groans upon the ground; the bishop meets them in this posture with tears, and prostrates himself with them; the whole congregation joins with them in their mourning; then the bishop first rises, and raises those who are as yet prostrate; and after putting up proper prayers to God for penitent sinners, he dismisses them. So much for the public: but then every man of them, for himself in private, mortifies himself with all manner of austerities, as he is directed by the bishop, whose appointments he punctually observes, and waits contentedly the time which is thus allotted him for his continuance under the forementioned rigours. Then when the period assigned him is finished, and the debt as it were cancelled, his sin is remitted, and he associates as before with the rest of the faithful. *This hath been the usage of the Roman Church from the very beginning to our present age.*'[158] A touching picture, truly, this of the earnestness and simplicity of those thorough-going days! It contains strong grounds, surely, for asserting that the penitential system originated in the West, though it was eagerly caught up, and probably enlarged upon, in the East. At all events, it flourished there for some time in great exuberance; but then we are told, by the same authorities, that this office of penitentiary was abolished at Constantinople by Nectarius, about A. D. 390, and that 'the bishops of the churches all round about him followed his example.' Contrariwise not only was that office continued in the West, but it gained in importance; so much

[158] Soc. *E. H.* v. 19; Soz. *E. H.* vii. 17. I have borrowed these translations from Marshall's *Penit. Discipl. App.* 2 and 3.

so that 'Penitentials,' or its official textbooks, became quite as voluminous, and as much of a study as the Sentences themselves, or works upon Canon Law, resulting in a gigantic code of casuistry. Our own Archbishop Theodore was author of one of the first of these treatises, just as it was our own S. Anselm who was the founder of scholastic theology; and it was he apparently, Greek though he was, who introduced into the West 'the substitution of secret penance for secret offences:' in a word, private for public confession.[159]

§ 37. *Heresies passing from West to East propagate no Theological Errors.*

And this brings me to one of the most curious phenomena that I know of in ecclesiastical history, greatly confirmatory of the view which I have been expounding all along. Heresies passing from East to West seem to forget their theological errors—at least if they continue to exist at all—and occupy themselves exclusively with anthropology. Heresies passing from West to East keep to their own special subject, and never obtrude upon theology.

Both Novatus and Pelagius, to some extent, imported their errors into the East; but so far from troubling the theological world, they managed to recommend themselves to some of the most orthodox theologians. Celestius was indeed reprobated, under the idea that he supported Nestorius; but no condemnation was ever pronounced in the East of what we understand by Pelagianism. On the contrary, one of the greatest of Eastern Doctors, S. John Chrysostom, not only 'mourned over the monk Pelagius,'[160] but showed some decided leanings towards semi-pelagianism, at least, himself in connection with freewill. Modern Greeks find it still more difficult to exculpate Cyril Lucar from the charge of Calvinism. And if it be true that the office of penitentiary had been originally instituted as a practical counterpoise to Nova-

[159] Marshall. c. iii. § 1; and for a recent account of the *Pœnitentiale*, vide Mr. Maskell's *Diss. on Service Books*, *Monum. Rit. Eccl. Angl.* vol. i. p. civ. *et seq.*

[160] *Ep. ad Olymp. Op.* tom. iii. p. 577, ed. Ben.

tian errors, there can be little doubt but that S. Chrysostom, who succeeded Nectarius in the patriarchate of Constantinople, was far from advocating any revival of that office,[161] though there could have been no lack of Novatians in his own diocese. Constantine had bantered their bishop, Acesius, in terms that half betokened admiration.[162] Theodosius the Great, we are told, encouraged them to have their churches within the cities of his dominions, including Constantinople.[163] There is not the least hint that their teaching involved any theological heresy; there is positive reason for supposing that, in the East at least, it was never held to do so.

§ 38. *Heresies passing from East to West affect Manners as well as Doctrine.*

But now look at the theological heresies that passed from East to West. First, it is worthy of notice how few of them ever passed over at all. Gnosticism and Sabellianism, Nestorianism and Eutychianism, we may well imagine to have been too subtle for Western intellects. Arianism made more progress, but in its coarsest forms, especially in Spain, where however it was extinguished in A.D. 585. Montanism and Manichæism[164] had a much longer reign; but they diffused

[161] His words are these: 'I do not desire to expose you upon the public stage, before your fellow-servants; nor do I compel you to discover your sins in the presence of men, but to unfold your conscience to God, to show Him your ail and malady, and to seek relief from Him.' *Homil.* v., quoted by Marshall, c. ii. p. 1, § 1.

[162] On his saying, '*Ἐλπίδα τῆς ἀφέσεως μὴ παρὰ τῶν ἱερέων, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐνδέχεσθαι, τοῦ δυναμένου καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντος συγχωρεῖν ἁμαρτήματα,*' —which is the very position of Protestants, — the reply of Constantine was terse enough: '*Θὲς, ὦ Ἀκέσιε, κλίμακα, καὶ μόνος ἀνάβηθι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.*' Soc. *E. H.* i. 10.

[163] Soc. *E. H.* v. 20. '*ὡς ὁμόφρονας τῇ αὐτοῦ πίστει.*' Comp. c. 21.

[164] On the Manicheans, S. Aug., epitomising what he says elsewhere: '*Electi* Manichæorum, velut sanctius et excellentius *auditoribus* suis. Nam his duobus professionibus, hoc est, Electorum et Auditorum, ecclesiam suam constare voluerunt.' Further on of the Elect: 'unde etiam *Catharistæ* appellantur, quasi purgatores.' Again: 'Promissionem D. N. Jesu Christi de Paracleto . . in suo hæresiarchâ Manichæo dicunt esse completam.' *Hær.* c. 46 (comp. S. Epiphan. *Hær.* lxvi. § 19). Exactly what he had said of the Montanists, *Hær.* c. 26: 'Quorum auctores fuerunt Montanus tanquam Paracletus . . . adventum Spiritûs Sancti a Domino promissum in se potius, quam in Apostolis, fuisse redditum.'

anthropological or sacramental, rather than theological, errors. The West cared not for their theological vagaries, but it snapped up greedily what they had to say against the sacraments, against the hierarchy, against church discipline. It sympathised with the claims to inspiration by the one, and with the agitation of the problem '*πόθεν τὸ κακόν*,'[165] by the other. Montanism, in fact, preceded Novatianism in the West, and outlived it. One of its most remarkable conquests was Tertullian; but it affected his notions of discipline, his practice, much more than his theology. Witness his four works,[166] written expressly against the Church, into which theology does not enter. On the other hand, his work against Praxeas is in defence of orthodoxy. Montanism seems to have turned the heads likewise of the African martyrs, Felicitas and Perpetua;[167] and, if we may believe the statements of Tertullian, Rome itself had at one time listened to its prophecies with approval.[168]

Manichæism for a time enthralled S. Augustine by his own confession. At a later period, it was charged upon him by the Pelagians for asserting the existence of concupiscence in fallen man, though regenerate.[169] It was the crime alleged against Priscillian, who was the first to suffer capital punishment for heresy. But it was clearly much more for setting the laws of society at defiance, and for his sinister practices, that he suffered, than for any theological unsoundness, though I by no means dispute the fact of the latter.[170] Vagaries of

[165] 'Cum a me quærerent, unde malum,' &c. S. Aug. *Confess.* iii. 7. Comp. his *Disput. contra Fortunat.*

[166] 1. *De Pudicitiâ.* 2. *De Fugâ in Persecutione.* 3. *De Jejuniis.* 4. *De Monogamiâ.* S. Epiph. *Hær.* xlviii. § 11 says of the Montanists generally: '*Περὶ Πατρὸς, καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ὁμοίως φρονοῦσι τῇ Ἁγίᾳ Καθολικῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ.*'

[167] Gieseler *E. H.* per. i. div. iii. § 59, note 9.

[168] *Adv. Prax.* c. i. 'Romanum episcopum, agnoscentem jam prophetias Montani, Priscæ, Maximillæ; et, ex eâ agnitione, pacem ecclesiis Asiæ et Phrygiæ inferentem.'

[169] Occasioning his work *De Nupt. et Concupisc.* v. lib. ii. 22.

[170] V. Forbes *Instruct. Historico-Theol.* lib. xii. 9, 5. 'Hi etiam verbum perfectionis et scientiæ sibi temerè vindicabant, ut loquitur de iis Hieron. Ep. ad Ctesiph.' (*Ep.* cxxxiii. § 3, ed. Migne.) Gibbon's remarks (c. xxvii.) on the edicts of Theodosius against heretics, and on the execution of Priscillian, may be compared with what follows.

the intellect, as such, are comparatively harmless to society; not so vagaries of the heart and of the passions. It is on this ground evidently that the epithet 'noxious' is applied to one of the few sects threatened with capital punishment in the Theodosian Code. Godfrey shows that capital punishment was never decreed against heretics generally by the laws of the empire, and that its infliction was only threatened in some special cases.[171] When, therefore, we find it denounced against Encratites,[172] Montanists,[173] and Manichæans,[174] we are driven to the conclusion that these sects must have made themselves more than ordinarily obnoxious to the civil power, by some teaching or practice which they maintained in common, and thus we are led to the root of the evil at once.[175] They had doubtless, each one of them, some peculiar tenets of their own; what they all held to was the condemnation of marriage, abstinence from meats as unclean, affectation of superior purity—too commonly degenerating into promiscuous crime. It is but a step from undisciplined austerity to unbridled licentiousness; and religious enthusiasts, who set themselves above law, are generally found to violate law the most. Eastern heretics had a name which embraced many

[171] Paratitl. ad *Cod. Theodos.* lib. xvi. tit. v. *De Hæret.* (vol. vi. p. 109).

[172] Law 9, promulgated in A.D. 382, two years before Priscillian was executed. For the peculiarities of the Encratites see Euseb. *E. H.* iv. 29.

[173] Law 34 of Arcadius, promulgated in A.D. 398.

[174] Law 35 of Arcadius, promulgated in A.D. 399.

[175] Mr. Motley has spoken of one of the most notorious of these heresiarchs thus (*Rise of the Dutch Rep.* vol. i. introd. p. 60): 'As early as the beginning of the twelfth century the notorious Tauchelyn preached at Antwerp, attacking the authority of the Pope and of all other ecclesiastics; scoffing at the ceremonies and sacraments of the Church. Unless his character and career have been grossly misrepresented, he was the most infamous of the many impostors who have so often disgraced the cause of religious reformation. By more than four centuries he anticipated the licentiousness and greediness manifested by a series of false prophets, and was the first to turn both the stupidity of a populace and the viciousness of a priesthood to his own advancement: an ambition which afterwards reached its most signal expression in the celebrated John of Leyden.' Horrible as his excesses may have been, however (Ib. p. 71), they cannot for a moment be held to excuse the inhuman penalties of the edict of A.D. 1550 (Ib. p. 228).

varieties of them, and implied superior intellectual excellence—or Gnostics: Western heretics affected another common name, and it was a Greek one likewise, though its formal adoption belongs to a Western sect, and it has its well-known modern equivalent amongst ourselves,[176] betokening superior moral excellence—or Catharists.[177] In the ages of theological heresy, that term had been appropriated by the Novatians, who had separated themselves from the Church solely upon the score of discipline; by a later age, it was appropriated to the Manichæans, who then began to spread themselves over the West, much more as preachers of a new morality than of a new creed. Judicial astrology was the only speculative error propagated by the Manichæans that seems to have taken any deep root in the West; on the other hand, as Catharists, they may be looked upon as the parents of every Western, or anthropological, heresy. Gibbon has a masterly chapter on their revival and subsequent career, and sums up their vicissitudes in the following pregnant sentence:—'About the middle of the seventh century'—that is, in the very age in which the last theological heresy, Monothelism, was condemned—'a branch of the Manichæans was selected as the victims of spiritual tyranny; their patience was at length exasperated to despair and rebellion, and their exile has scattered over the West the seeds of reformation.'[178] In other words, their exile did for error what the taking of Constantinople by Mahomet II. did for art and science in Europe—so true is it that all our good and evil in life came from the East. 'Of the Catharists,' says Reinerius,[179] the Inquisitor-General of the thirteenth century, who had himself been seventeen years

[176] Puritans.

[177] There can be little doubt about the origin of this word, though it has been variously derived. See S. Aug. *Hær.* c. 46, before cited; and compare Euseb. *E. H.* vi. 43 *ad init.*; *Can. Nicæn.* viii.; *Can. Constant.* vii.; and S. Basil's 1*st Can. Ep.* to Amphil.; *Can.* 1 ap. Johnson, *Vade Mecum*, vol. ii. p. 225, for its appropriation by the Novatians. Yet Moreri and Hoffman *s. v.* show that both Encratites and Montanists laid claim to it likewise. It is curious to compare the little attraction which the term 'Gnostics,' as well as the sect, had for the West.

[178] *Decline and Fall*, c. liv.

[179] Contra Wald. ap. *Max. Bibl. Pat.* tom. xxv. p. 262.

one of them, 'there were three principal branches: Albanenses, Concorezenses, and Bagnolenses, all of whom inhabited Lombardy.' Afterwards, he reckons no less than sixteen different communities of them westwards of Constantinople. Switzerland, France, and Italy then abounded with them, under various names. They were undoubtedly not the same; but they became gradually mixed up with the poor men of Lyons, the followers of Peter of Bruis, and of the monk Henry, till they disappear, one and all, under the more modern terms Albigenses and Waldenses, to make common cause with the disciples of Wickliff and of John Huss.[180]

§ 39. *Heresies of the West essentially Anthropological.*

Now what I assert of these sects from first to last is, not that their theology was always wholly erroneous, nor again that it was ever free from error of some kind or other, but that they cannot be charged with having invented any new theological heresy. What they advocated prominently, concurrently, and persistently was ecclesiastical revolt; in other words, a system of antagonism to church ordinances and church discipline; teaching that was opposed to any hypothesis of divine grace in the Sacraments; of any special prerogatives in the clergy; of any inherent authority in the Church to make laws binding on the conscience, for social order or public worship amongst nations; for edification or correction of individuals. Here, therefore, lay the true difference between them and the old heresiarchs of the East. Their offences were against man rather than God; against the laws of Christian society rather than the laws of Christian orthodoxy. Not but that they affected to have rites, sacraments, and teachers of their own, while they rejected those of the Church. Their plea was, that the immoral lives of the clergy alienated them from the Church. Giving them the full benefit of that plea, we cannot deny that the lawfully-constituted authorities of Christendom had their plea likewise for retaliation; nor

[180] For the general subject see Gieseler *E. H.* par. iii. div. iii. § 87, and Bossuet's masterly sketch, *Hist. des Variat.* liv. xi.

are the names of such men as S. Bernard and Peter the Venerable, who took strong part indeed with authority, but never with vice, to be forgotten in adjusting the scale. Strongly as I am averse to capital punishment for any crime but murder, entirely as I sympathise with those burning words of Count de Montalembert,[181] on a late occasion: 'Je le déclare donc, j'éprouve une invincible horreur pour tous les supplices et toutes les violences faites à l'humanité, sous prétexte de servir, ou de défendre la religion,' I am constrained to observe that Christian society, no less than any other, has its rights of self-defence, and that treasonable practices against authorities lawfully constituted, be they Christian or not, are rightly punished. On the mode and measure of punishment to be administered, each age will always claim to be the best judge. Our own statute-book has been but recently purged of the cruel criminal code of our own immediate ancestors; and we ourselves of the nineteenth century, with all our fondness for freedom and toleration, have not yet learnt—and should we ever learn?—to pardon those who plot against our Constitution and our Queen. Speculative errors neither do we visit with capital punishment now, nor did the Greeks formerly. Not one of the theological heresiarchs is recorded to have perished on the scaffold or at the stake.[182]

[181] *L'Église Libre, &c., au Congrès Catholique de Malines*, p. 134. He adds, grandly: 'Le bâillon enfoncé dans la bouche de quiconque parle avec un cœur pur, pour prêcher sa foi, je le sens entre mes propres lèvres, et j'en frémis de douleur. . . . L'inquisitor Espagnol disant à l'hérétique: "la vérité ou la mort," m'est aussi odieux que le terroriste Français disant à mon grand-père, "la liberté, la fraternité, ou la mort."'

[182] 'Neque dici potest, quod olim nullæ fuerint hæreses; fuerunt enim diversis temporibus, et quidem gravissimæ, quæ jugulum Christianismi petebant, imprimis Arianorum illa—illa teterrima. . . . Nunquid autem majores nostri, ut illam extinguerent, sanguine baptizatorum se polluerunt, ut nunc in Papatu fit' (he is speaking more particularly of the Inquisition) 'aliquandò etiam ob esum carnium duntaxat.'—*Epist. Gerardi Busdragi Episcop. Argolic. ad Cardm. Pisanum*, Paduâ, Dec. 15, 1548, ap. *Miscell. Groning.* vol. i. p. 319.

§ 40. *Christian Anthropology.—Objective and Subjective.—The first, the Work of the Middle Ages.*

Christian anthropology readily ranges itself under two heads—objective and subjective. By the former is meant the sacraments and ordinances of the Church, as such; by the latter, the progress of grace in the heart of each one of us. Here we get at the true clue, both to the dogmatism of the Mediæval Church, and to the heresies by which it was elicited or opposed. It was the objective part of Christian anthropology that came first in the order of logic, and was accordingly so brought out. The nature and effects of the sacraments, in themselves, and as distinguished from each other; the prerogatives of church-councils; of the hierarchy; the laws of Christian society; married and celibate, secular and religious life under the Gospel; Christian education; Christian benevolence to the poor; the relations of Church and State: all these questions were discussed with a vigour, and a freedom, and a fulness that the world had never known before, and compared with which the speculations of the Greek schools of philosophy were but shadowy outline. The progress of rites and ceremonies was attended by a corresponding development in Christian art—gorgeous achievements in painting, sculpture, architecture, that may be left to speak for themselves; universities and colleges that have never been rivalled; industrial activity in town and country.[183] We may have discarded nine-tenths of the doctrine and practice of the Middle Ages; but should we have possessed any of our own existing doctrine or practice upon any one of these subjects, had they not previously ventilated them, one and all, and in many cases suggested to us the true path, even while falling short of it, or swerving beside it, themselves? Thus, what may be called the school of medicine for humanity was thoroughly equipped and set in order; the drugs were purveyed, analysed,

[183] For the general subject see the *Histories of Civilisation*, by MM. Guizot and Ozanam; *Christian Art*, by M. Rio; Hurter's *History of Innocent III.*; and his *Institutions and Manners of the Church in the Middle Ages:* all in French except the first, which has been translated.

weighed, mixed in their proper proportions, labelled, and placed ready for use. The case of the patient had only to be studied, his dietary to be regulated, his constitution examined. The best medicine could not effect his cure without some concurrent action of his own.

§ 41. *Subjective Anthropology not studied by the Schoolmen.*

Now on the second, or subjective, part of Christian anthropology, the Mediæval Church threw out many pregnant hints, and contributed a fund of elaborate matter for enquiry, but, in point of fact, ruled nothing. There had been no definite system of error started as yet on that head since the days of Pelagius; and Pelagianism had already received its *coup-de-grace* from S. Augustine. It was not from the Manichæans either that any revival of Pelagianism was to be apprehended; for these two systems were diametrically opposed. Pelagius had exalted the natural powers of man to that extent that he had left no room for grace; the disciples of Manes, on the contrary, considered the natural man so depraved that, according to their teaching, ordinary grace was not sufficient for effecting his cure. Hence their fierce denunciations of the sacraments of the Church more especially, as assuming to effect that which they held to be impossible through the medium of material elements, which they held to be radically corrupt. To attempt to cure the evil in man through any application to it of the evil in matter was, from their point of view, hopelessly absurd. Still, while they reviled the church system, they never met it by any direct counter-statement of their own. They had no system but what was made up of negations and contradictions, of irregular practices and wild schemes; their only basis of agreement was antagonism to all that the Church of that day enjoined. On the other hand, in the Church itself, the subject of personal holiness, apart from the Sacraments, had been but little studied. Men were rather indoctrinated with the idea that the sacraments of the Church would do all for them, procure them heaven, with but

very little cooperation of their own: so that they took their medicine, whose life-giving properties had been proved beyond dispute, it did not so much matter how they lived. Their attention had been called off powerfully to what was without them, to the wonders of grace that were operating around them, till they had ceased to attend to what was within them. S. Thomas, indeed, had written, and numbers had commented on what he had written, on that charmed theme 'justification;'[184] but what a mere corner is given to it in his immortal work, and in the 'Book of the Sentences' it does not occur at all. Little more was, in fact, attempted by the schoolmen in this department than to extract and epitomise all that had been laid down by S. Augustine in his controversy with Pelagius on original sin, freewill, predestination, prevenient and cooperating grace, and final perseverance.

There was a theory still to be constructed out of these materials, and the time for drawing it out was gradually approaching. Facts proclaimed aloud that ordinances were powerless without due cooperation on the part of their recipients, in whose proper dispositions and corresponding lives was to be found a necessary complement to the sacraments themselves. All this may have been self-evident, but it had not been brought out, or at least formally adopted as part of the system.[185]

§ 42. *The point really raised by Luther.—Relevancy of his Appeal.*

Throughout the whole of the fifteenth century[186] there went up a cry, from one nation after another, for the refor-

[184] *Sum. Theol. Prima Secundæ*, q. cxiii. art. 1–10.

[185] In illustration of what is here advanced let me refer to the whole of that earnest and instructive chapter, headed 'The History of Communion,' in the work on *Communion*, by Father Dalgairns, particularly from p. 170; where, speaking of the great Lateran Council of A.D. 1215, he says: 'It was precisely then, when the world was at her feet, that the Church was compelled to enact penalties against her children who *did not* communicate once a year, and to limit her commands to an Easter communion, *because she durst not require more.*'

[186] 'Then came two terrible centuries, most difficult to characterise, the fourteenth and the fifteenth. The world had lost, in a great measure, the supernatural principles of the Middle Ages, and had not attained to the Pelagian virtues of modern times.

mation of manners. In the confusion which then reigned, obstacles were again and again thrown in the way of attending to it, till it was gradually hushed into silence, and thought to have died away. At length Luther arose, and, in direct contrast to all the mere reformers and declaimers against abuses in Church and State that had preceded him, raised the critical question: 'How am I—the living, intelligent, responsible, indivisible agent—justified? How do I participate personally in the redemption that has been wrought for man?'

What answer he returned to it himself is matter of secondary importance. The eagerness with which his writings that contained it were printed and disseminated[187] amongst all classes in Germany is a decisive proof of their worldwide relevancy. It was like starting the idea of manhood-suffrage in a vast community, till then living under a close oligarchy. His appeal was to the masses what the application of a lighted match is to the heap of innumerable dark grains collectively called gunpowder. Millions of subjectivities flashed into self-consciousness simultaneously, Every serf was reminded that he was a man—popes and emperors that they were no more than men. Individuals felt themselves addressed, not as members of a society, but as possessors of a conscience. Every soul was preoccupied with the account that it would have one day to give, naked and disembodied, before God. Every living 'I,'—man, woman,

I should call them the most unprincipled centuries of the Christian era.'—Father Dalgairns on the *Holy Communion*, c. vi. p. 173.

[187] 'The excitement was immense. The nobles and the people, the castles and the free towns, rivalled each other in zeal and enthusiasm for Luther. At Nuremburg and at Strasburg, even at Mayence, there was a constant struggle for his least pamphlets. The sheet, yet wet, was brought from the press under some one's coat, and passed from shop to shop . . . Nothing lent more powerful assistance to Luther than the zeal manifested by the printers and booksellers in favour of the new ideas. The books in support of Luther, says a contemporary,' (Cochlæus) 'were printed by the typographers with minute care, often at their own expense, and vast numbers of copies were thrown off. There was a complete body of ex-monks who, returned to the world, lived by vending the books of Luther throughout Germany.'—M. Michelet's *Life of Luther*, Hazlitt's *Tr.* p. 70.

and child—throughout Europe was set thinking about 'myself,' with a vehemence unknown before, and as obstinately bent upon telling 'my own' experiences. Doctors of the Church might well decide upon questions of pure theology, or of objective anthropology—on all that related to the fact or mode of the Incarnation, to the nature of the Sacraments, or to the discipline of the Church. On this one question all were doctors, all were cognisant of the phenomena that went on within them; and no solution of it that each one could not accept as a true description of his own case could be tolerated. Each individual had his own secret locked up in his own bosom, solely between him and his Maker; and even when men came to compare their experiences, there were scarcely any two souls whose history was found to be precisely similar. Personal privilege and personal responsibility were the two facts thus brought into prominence, and on these points Latin and Teutonic subjectivities were only too ready to join issue. Not only, therefore, was it a question that would admit of no shelving, but its very discussion was certain to entail more perplexity and diversity of opinion than had ever been experienced before since the Church was founded.[188] Never since the days of Arius had been heard such a strife of tongues, or seen such a multitude of creeds, every one of them a 'Makrostic'[189] on the subject of justification, and not one of them destined to be considered as final. The confusion which their unphilosophical language engendered gave fresh impulse to the mental movement that had been kindled. Individuals roused to reflect for themselves upon themselves, began to think for themselves upon all other subjects much more intensely than they had ever done before, till as completely a new era dawned upon Christendom as a new world upon Europe. One after another,

[188] This is the true key to those facts, of which Bossuet has made such eloquent use in his *Histoire des Variations des Églises Protestantes*. Where men are thrown upon their individuality it is always a case of 'Quot homines tot sententiæ.'

[189] For the last of the five Arian creeds, so called on account of its length, see Soc. *E. H.* ii. 18. 'Περὶ τῆς μακροστίχου ἐκθέσεως.'

men, betook themselves to the study of those inductive sciences which undoubtedly may have confirmed them in their individuality, but which since the days of Thales and Anaxagoras had lain dormant and forgotten. They, no less than the sublime theories of Aristotle and Plato, and the traditionary arts of Zeuxis and Phidias, required to be Christianised, and made to do homage to the Gospel. Those sciences that reposed upon authority had monopolised attention during the middle ages, while the problem of objective anthropology was being worked out; and those sciences that depended upon experiment and free enquiry now came up for investigation, when man, woman, and child had been set thinking on their personal responsibilities and inward gifts. The middle ages had been the reign of authority and of the body politic; now was about to commence, by comparison, the reign of experiment and of individuals.

§ 43. *Council of Trent.—The subjects ruled by it.—What it only confirmed.—Summary of its teaching.*

It was while society was thus seething and fermenting, and passing rapidly into a new phase of existence, that the Council of Trent met, to answer that question which Luther had started so many years before, and which he and so many others had already answered for themselves. Loud and general as had been the cry for Reform, that subject might have been staved off, as it had been again and again previously, but for this unique problem that had been appended to it, challenging a declaration of doctrine on the part of the Church. Without abdicating her functions, she could not but reply to it, and that forthwith, or as soon as possible. Luther's own answer to it, dictated by the circumstances of his own times, shall be considered separately. The true theory of our justification before God through Christ had nothing whatever to do with the state of morals in the Church at that particular time, or any other. In the purest ages of the Church ever known, its discussion must have

produced the same mental excitement throughout Christendom—the same thrill amongst individuals. Whether Luther would have found advocates for his own special theory in a purer age may well be doubted. As it was, the Council of Trent met, and laid down, with a precision that has never been surpassed, the second or subjective part of Christian anthropology; then strove to give effect to it in a series of decrees for reformation of manners; then finally recapitulated and confirmed all that had been ruled in the West previously respecting the sacraments and church-discipline, thereby completing its dogmatic code. But its own proper work lay in what was decreed in its sixth session. It took a comprehensive survey of Christianity in its most practical or moral aspects; brought it home to the individual in his inmost life; revealed its workings and effects—its commencements, conflicts, and final issues. It showed what man had been before the Fall, and what he had become through the Fall; not dead, but wounded—with his freewill impaired, not extinguished. It showed that he never could have regained his equilibrium, or done for himself what Christ had done for him; how his regeneration or new birth in Christ was effected, the grace of God by no means excluding the co-operation of man. It showed, finally, how the sacraments bore upon his new existence, and in what temper or frame of mind they were to be approached. On their formal character it had positively nothing to say, but to reiterate what had been said and taught before.[190] There was one subject alone where it ventured

[190] For this general view of the Council of Trent I need go no further than the late Mr. Hallam (*Lit. of Europe*, part ii. c. 2, note 5), whose remarks deserve to be recorded at full length: 'A strange notion has been started of late years in England, that the Council of Trent made important innovations in the previously established doctrines of the Western Church: an hypothesis so paradoxical in respect to public opinion, and, it must be added, *so prodigiously at variance with the known facts of ecclesiastical history*, that we cannot but admire the facility with which it has been taken up. It will appear . . . that even in certain points, such as justification, *which had not been clearly laid down before*, the Tridentine decrees were mostly conformable with the sense of the majority of those doctors who had obtained the highest reputation; and that upon what are more usually reckoned the distinctive characteristics of the Church of Rome,

upon any original dogmatism—that subject on which it could no longer be silent—Justification. And what the assembled Fathers of Trent laid down in connection with it has been considered a masterpiece by some of the most learned of their opponents. Here, therefore, Western Christendom had come to the end of Christian anthropology, as the East of Christian theology, in the days of the 6th General Council—in the age that produced Mohammed. Summarily condensed, its dogmatic teaching will be found to be that Christian anthropology, subjective as well as objective, is a system of realities, as opposed to the figures of things, or tropes of speech—a system of inward causation from without, producing inward effects. It enlarged on the reality of the sacraments; on the reality of our justification, or change from unrighteousness to righteousness, that is designed to be effected through, or in connection with them; on the reality of our graces and good works. By reality was implied the action of God the Holy Ghost: and, as the effect of that action, union with God the Son. These were positive realities: but there were some negative realities on which it insisted no less, particu-

namely, transubstantiation, purgatory, and the invocation of the Saints and the Virgin, *they assert nothing but what had been so ingrafted into the faith of this part of Europe, as to have been rejected by no one without suspicion or imputation of heresy.*' Yet this notion, unfair and contrary to fact as it is, was originally put forward by Leibnitz, to be as strongly contradicted by Bossuet in several of his replies to that distinguished man. —Let. vii. bearing date Jan. 10, 1692, and xl. dated Aug. 12, 1701; *Hist. des Var.* vol. ii. pp. 391 and 571, ed. 12mo., Paris, 1845. Hallam proceeds: 'No general council ever contained so many persons of eminent learning as that of Trent; nor is there any ground for believing that any other ever investigated the questions before it with so much patience, acuteness, temper, and desire of truth. The early councils, unless they are greatly belied, would not bear comparison in these characteristics. . . . They (the Fathers of Trent) had only one leading prejudice, that of determining theological faith according to the tradition of the Catholic Church, as handed down to their own age.' Splendid praise this, the last sentence included. Speaking of the dogmatical portion of the sixth session, the decree on Justification, Mr. Waterworth says (*Hist.* part ii. p. 105): 'If it be permitted to draw a comparison between one division of the labours of the council and another, it will probably be thought that this session of the Council of Trent surpasses that of any other session, and is not excelled by any other council of any other age.' —Comp. p. 101.

larly these two:—1. The existence of original sin in all men before regeneration, and the continuance of concupiscence in all men after regeneration; 2. The freedom of the will throughout, to resist grace offered, and reject grace received. These great truths have been growing upon the mind of Christendom ever since; and the value of the positions laid down by the Council of Trent was never better appreciated than about the time of its tercentenary. Moehler succeeded to demonstration in establishing and elucidating its negative realities: and nowhere are its positive realities more brilliantly set forth than in the work of Dr. Newman upon Justification,[191] and the works of the late Mr. R. Wilberforce on the Incarnation and the Holy Eucharist.

§ 44. *Christian Anthropology recapitulated.—Office of the Holy Ghost.*

The whole subject of Christian anthropology, therefore, as taught by the West, may be resumed as follows—The Incarnate Word sent that same Holy Ghost to unite man, in, and out of the sacraments, to His Humanity, by Whose operation He had in His Own Person assumed that Humanity in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Here is, in a few words, the true connecting link between imputative and inherent righteousness in the first place; between objective and subjective anthropology, as taught by the West, in the second; and between Western and Eastern theology in the third. The Procession of the Holy Ghost, on which East and West are divided, and the justification and sanctification of man, on

[191] I instance the following passages: 'Justification is the application of Christ's merits to the individual . . . a real and actual communication to the soul of the Atonement, through the ministration of the Spirit . . . the habitation in us of God the Father, and the Word Incarnate, through the Holy Ghost.'—Lect. vi. § 4. 'The indwelling of Christ risen and glorified.'—Lect. viii. ad f., and ix. throughout. More generally, Lect. xii.: 'Justification comes *through* the sacraments; is received *by* faith; *consists* in God's inward presence, and *lives* in obedience.' Mr. Wilberforce's divine works may be viewed as sermons preached on this text, particularly the third part.

68218

which Western Christendom is divided, are correlatives—neither more nor less—and one is not complete without the other. It is the Blessed Paraclete on whom controversy turns in either case; on His relation, first to Christ, and then to Christians. Does He proceed from the Son as well as the Father? is, in practical language, Was He Christ's to give? Then, if it be asked further, for what purpose? the practical answer is, for effecting our justification and sanctification. He was sent by Christ to unite mankind with Christ; to incorporate each one of us into the Humanity of the Word made Flesh; to make each one of us all partaker, in a true, real, and not figurative sense, of all the life-giving benefits of the Incarnation—of the all-sufficient merits of the Atonement. This is one reason, at all events, why He was given to Christ—to bestow upon man; and this is what He effects in every redeemed man, woman, and child. Whether through faith alone, or through faith made perfect by works, as there is opportunity for them—for both are His gifts—whether through the sacraments, where they can be had, or without the sacraments, where they cannot be had: God the Holy Ghost is the efficient cause both of our justification and of our sanctification, by making us one with Christ—by bringing each one of us into corporate union with God made Man. As the Books of the Old and New Testament were written by His inspiration—as the Son of God became Man by His operation—so the Church was constituted the Spouse of Christ by His indwelling; and every one of us, to be admitted into fellowship with Christ, has to be made His Temple. Hence it is that sin against the Holy Ghost is stigmatised in the New Testament as the worst of sins; hence it is that those who deny the Inspiration of the Scriptures are precisely those who refuse to admit any Divine agency in the collective Church, or within themselves. In each case, they are parts of the same truth which are attacked or believed. Men cannot but believe all three, or else they must inevitably end in believing in none.

§ 45. *The Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin—how a Corollary to the whole subject.*

Now, it is this view of the office of the Holy Ghost, in connection with our justification and sanctification, which is the true key to the interest which has from the earliest ages, by East and West alike, been attached to the Conception of the Blessed Virgin. Who can deny the immense light thrown upon it by the coincidence, that what the West has ruled on that subject, within memory, should have been first suggested by the Pelagian heresy—that heresy which evoked some of the earliest decisions of the West on Christian anthropology—that heresy to which incidental allusion was made in that general council which declared the title of 'Θεοτόκος,' or 'Mother of God,' applicable to the Blessed Virgin? Meanwhile, it was the seventh canon of that same council which the East afterwards alleged against the addition of those words 'Filioque' to their creed by the West—How true to their respective provinces have West and East been throughout; the East to its creed, the West to what may be called its moral code: the East ruling, in primitive times, of S. Mary, that she was the Mother of God—the West, in modern times, that she was conceived without sin! How characteristic of the Western mind, to be pronouncing upon questions in the nineteenth century, which had been originally started in the fifth: and on which all along it had been gazing with unwearied pertinacity! And here I feel compelled to digress briefly, and to confess myself to have completely misunderstood this exquisitely delicate subject in former days, and to have argued against the received view of it on a totally false hypothesis.[192] I argued against it, on the ground that those rapturous expressions (on which so much stress is laid by the advocates of the received dogma) in the Song of Solomon could but apply to the Church or Spouse of Christ, and that what was addressed to His Bride could not, without impro-

[192] See Appendix C. to the *Counter Theory*, p. 265 et seq.

priety and manifest strain of the text, be applied to His Mother. A simple dedication over the door of the Certosa, or Carthusian convent of Pavia, not far from Milan, dispelled my illusions some years back. It runs as follows :—

'Mariæ Virgini—
Filiæ, Matri, Sponsæ, Dei.'

I had been reciting, from infancy, words in the Creed to the effect that Our Lord had been 'conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary;' but I had never so mastered the idea previously, as to regard the Blessed Virgin as Spouse of the Holy Ghost. I now studied the Book of Canticles from a very different point of view. If it stood on the same footing with the rest of the Scriptures, it must have been inspired or dictated by the Holy Ghost, whose Spouse was, in reality, S. Mary, not the Church. Therefore, in its primary meaning, it was prophetic, not of the union between Our Lord and His Church, but between the Holy Ghost—the real Author of that Song of Songs—and His Mother. Looking therefore at the doctrine of her Immaculate Conception, in part through the medium of these considerations, in part through the medium of our own justification and sanctification, one may surely regard it as the true complement of both, and the natural corollary to the whole subject? All that is really implied by it is, that the Holy Ghost operated in the Blessed Virgin, from the first moment of her Conception; and throughout her life, that which He has, ever since the Day of Pentecost, operated in every man, woman, and child at the moment of their reception of Christian baptism. He took away from the act of her Conception all that He takes away from each one of us at the instant of our Baptism; and that grace which, unfortunately, we are too apt to commence declining from the next moment afterwards, He by extraordinary privilege preserved ever afterwards intact through life in her alone, for whom alone was reserved the extraordinary honour of becoming His Spouse, and Mother of the Incarnate Word. For those who believe thoroughly in the Divine gift bestowed in Baptism, there can be no difficulty in believing in the Imma-

culate Conception of the Mother of God. It was but the anticipation of what is accomplished in our own persons by the same Divine Agent, only carried out and perpetuated to perfection in her case. There is one instance recorded of a grade which is intermediate between her case and our own, upon indisputable testimony. It is that of S. John the Baptist: 'He shall be filled with the Holy Ghost,' said the Angel Gabriel, 'even from his mother's womb.'[193] Even this distinction has not been lost on the Church. Of all Saints, S. John Baptist stands alone as commemorated on the day of his birth, as the Mother of God on the day of her Conception—both as without sin. I will add, before I quit the subject, that there is no one fact more certain, or more unique, in the annals of church-history, than that, amidst the countless discoveries which have been reported of relics of saints in every age, there never has been so much as a breath of any discovery of any portion of that sacred body in which, and out of which, the Word was made Flesh. The Assumption of S. Mary would, at least, be one intelligible explanation of that extraordinary fact; it would be likewise but the natural consequence of her Immaculate Conception.

§ 46. *Teaching of the West accepted practically by the East.*

All that remains to be said, in conclusion, is that the East has practically subscribed to the anthropological teaching of the West, as the West has ever accepted the theological teaching of the East. At one time, indeed, it seemed that prejudice against the See of Rome would have outweighed all other considerations, and procured for the false tenets of Luther and Calvin a favourable reception there. It undoubtedly produced that effect upon the greatest Eastern patriarch of modern days, Cyril Lucar; and, for a time, the weight of his name, added to his 'Confession,' paralysed the defenders of orthodoxy.[194] At length the synods of Constantinople (A. D.

[193] S. Luke i. 15.

[194] A full account of all which is given by Mr. Neale, *Patriarch. of Alex.* vol. ii. pp. 411–55.

1638) and of Jassy (A.D. 1642) formally condemned his errors;[195] and if the synod of Bethlehem, in A.D. 1672. attempted to dispute the authenticity of his 'Confession,' and to clear his memory, it still more unequivocally vindicated the Eastern Church from any complicity with Western errors:[196] for in its Eighteen Articles almost every position advanced by Luther or Calvin is expressly condemned, and the teaching of the Council of Trent upheld against them, even to the sanction of the term 'transubstantiation,' of the invocation of the saints, and of a belief in purgatory. Fifty years afterwards—when, on the occasion of Arsenius, Archbishop of Thebes, coming into England on a begging mission, overtures for intercommunion had been despatched from England to Constantinople—'the Eastern patriarchs sent the Book of the Eighteen Articles as their ultimatum, to be received without further question or conference, in details no less than in substance, by all who would obtain their communion.'[197] Of the same character were the 'Answers of the Patriarch Jeremiah to the Lutherans,' and the 'Orthodox Confession of the Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East.'[198] If they do not establish perfect identity upon all points between East and West, they establish perfect identity between them, at all events, in respect of that system of error which culminated in Luther, and to which the general name of Protestantism has since been applied.

§ 47. *Heresies of the East contrasted with Mohammedanism.*

Now what was that system, and what have been its effects? In other words, how did Luther answer that question, which

[195] Neale, *Patriarch. of Alex.* vol. ii. pp. 457–63.

[196] Ibid. pp. 464–72.

[197] See Mr. Blackmore's *Doctrine of the Russian Ch.* Introd. pp. xxv.–xxviii. He is of opinion that the Russian synod was inclined to be more lenient. It was Peter the Great's wish that it should be—as will be shown in its proper place. Meanwhile compare Mouravieff's *Hist. of the Russian Ch.* (Mr. B.'s translation), pp. 286–88, and the notes. This was the final reply of the Easterns, and is dated Sept. 1723.

[198] Ibid. pp. xvi.–xxv.

he raised with so much moment and significance, 'How am I justified?' In my humble opinion, it has still to be placed and considered in its proper light. East and West require to be brought into juxtaposition once more. Looking at the long list of Oriental heresies of the first six centuries or thereabouts, it is impossible to be more struck with their number and multiformity than with their abrupt close. Up to the seventh century they sprang up one after another, and fructified in all manner of shapes and hues. Infinitesimal were the complications into which the Monophysites twisted and interlaced themselves—infinitesimal the intellectual subtleties to which they gave rise. All at once they ceased to be prolific, and their number was never really added to from that time forth. There was a lull, in fact, in their activity, just as Monothelism was receiving its condemnation, just as the last coping-stone was being laid upon the theological arch; but it was the treacherous lull that precedes a storm. And what was that hurricane? It was not heresy; it was not any new-fangled teaching, wilful, erroneous, and persistent, upon any one branch of Christian theology, as all other heresies had been. It was the antithesis of all Christian theology; as though its founder had been holding unseen intercourse with every teacher of false doctrine that had preceded him, and distilled the essential oils of all their errors into his own system. Mohammed was no heresiarch in the ordinary sense of the word;[199] he was Antichrist, neither more nor less; if not the first, the greatest of any that had yet appeared. What, in short, had been the antagonism of Eutyches, or Nestorius, or even of Paul of Samosata, to the Creed of Nicæa, compared with his—'There is no God but one God, and Mohammed is the prophet of God'? In this short sentence was contained the contradictory to every Christian dogma.

This is so true, practically, that it stands out as one of the great landmarks of history. Christianity, since its establishment, has never given ground to any rival creed but one, that

[199] See *Christian Remembrancer* for January, 1855, p. 143. One of the strongest proofs is that he was never condemned by any œcumenical council.

of the Koran, and by the Koran it has been rudely dispossessed of half its fairest conquests. It may have its ultimate triumph in store still. Its prospects seem brightening, its adversaries are wasting away for certain; yet for many centuries the Cross has been in undoubted bondage to the Crescent[200] on two continents: extirpated in some places, condemned to exist on sufferance in others; the religion of slaves or subordinates, revered in secret, reviled in public; doomed to connive in silence at wholesale apostasies from its own faith, precluded from making reprisals or aggression of any kind on that faith which it believes to be false.

§ 48. *Inconsistency of the Koran.—Christ how dethroned in it.*

It would be of small use quoting the letter of the Koran against facts like these, were the Koran more consistent with itself than it really is.[201] There are passages in it where

[200] On the Crescent as an emblem, see a remark in Dean Stanley's *Memorials of Canterbury*, app. p. 278, note g., 'On the Crescent in the roof of Canterbury Cathedral.'

[201] For what follows I rely upon the following passages principally:—

1. *Sura* iii. v. 78. 'We believe in God; and in what hath been sent down to Abraham, and Ismael, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the tribes; and in what was given to Moses, and Jesus, and the Prophets, from their Lord. We make no difference between them, and to Him are we resigned.'—p. 506.

2. *Sura* ii. v. 253. 'One of the sent ones art Thou.'—p. 467.

3. Ibid. v. 254. 'Some of the Apostles we have endowed more highly than others; those to whom God hath spoken He hath raised to the loftiest grade; and to Jesus the Son of Mary we gave manifest signs, and we strengthened Him with the Holy Spirit. And if God had pleased, they who came after them would not have wrangled (elsewhere, 'split up their religion into parties'), after the clear signs had reached them. But into disputes they fell; some of them believed, and some were infidels: yet if God had pleased they would not have thus wrangled; but God doth what He will.

4. *Sura* lxi. v. 6. 'Remember when Jesus the Son of Mary said, "O children of Israel! Of a truth I am God's Apostle to you, to confirm the law which was given before me, and to announce an apostle that shall come after me, whose name shall be Ahmed! But when he (Ahmed) presented himself, with clear proofs of his mission, they said, "This is manifest sorcery." '—p. 522. Mr. Rodwell's *Tr.* (London, 1861), with his note on the last extract; and comp. Mr. Meyrick's *Tr.* of the *Life and Religion of Mohammed*, c. xviii. p. 308. Moehler's *Relation of Islam to the Gos-*

Christ is spoken of as a prophet from God—as the greatest of all prophets before Mohammed; He is never, in fact, mentioned but with honour. His miraculous birth and life upon earth is not denied; even the immaculate conception of His mother seems allowed; His final victory over Antichrist is predicted. Can the man be properly called Antichrist who so wrote? Decidedly he can; and it is for that very reason that I have so designated him. Mohammed used Christ as his own stepping-stone; he made Christ his tool. He allowed him as much honour as would redound to his own glory, and no more. He admitted all in the history of our Blessed Lord that he could turn to account in building up his own system; he rejected all that was incompatible with, or adverse to it. He is content, he is desirous, that Our Lord should be considered the greatest of all previous prophets,—that his own *eclât* in superseding Him might come out the more; he is not above seeking authority for his own claims in His prophetic words. Naturally enough, he cannot admit Him to have been the Son of God, or to have died for man. This is the sum and substance of his antagonism; yet what more was necessary? To have acknowledged either of these two facts would have been fatal to his own mission; but by rejecting them, he effectually dethroned Christ. Who would have listened to one claiming to supersede God, or to regenerate man already redeemed? Yet take away the Divinity of Our Lord and His atonement from Christianity, and what remains? Mohammed, as many had done before him,[202] asserted that the Scriptures had been interpolated, and that it was one part of his mission to restore them to their original purity. He assumed to be acting the part of a true friend to Christ while divesting Him of His Divine Sonship, and reducing Him to the level of a mere holy man. Paul of Samosata, and others, had gone thus far, but it was their extreme point. Mohammed walked over His head deliberately, and appealed to His witness, as to an inferior, much in the same way that Our

pel (Mr. Menge's *Tr.*, Calcutta, 1847) has suggested many of my remarks and assertions.

[202] Beginning with Artemon. See Euseb. *E. H.* v. 28.

Lord had done to that of S. John Baptist. Here, again, he may be said to have borrowed a page from Montanus, who professed to be the promised Paraclete; but then Montanus never assumed to supersede Christ, as did Mohammed.

Mohammed, therefore, honoured Christ to supersede Him, and superseded Christ by degrading Him. This is his characteristic feature, as distinguished from all other heresiarchs; and by these means he certainly achieved a greater success than all combined. It might have been a less offence to have denied Him outright, but it would have by no means answered his own purpose equally well. Antichrist too as he was, he does not come up to the full Antichrist described by S. Paul. If he hated Christ in his heart, he has dissembled it. As far as I can make out, there are no traces of overt malignant antipathy for Him in the Koran; and if he denied His Divinity, it was not to set up himself instead, *as God*. For any hatred of Christ, I am inclined to think he may have been outstripped by some of our own infidels, at home and abroad, of the last century; and even for any hatred of Christianity, it is quite possible that he never quite contemplated being the Antichrist which he has been in his descendants the Turks. As far as the letter of the Koran goes, it might be maintained that he designed his creed to be merely dominant, but not therefore intolerant. It has been suggested that he may have grown more intolerant as his prospects brightened, and his own notions of his prophetic office intensified. On the other hand, it was the keystone of his position to keep up appearances with Christianity, and to trace his own pedigree, as it were, through Christ, till it had a history of its own. There can be no greater proof of his sagacity than his having realised and acted upon this principle as he has done. Every 'parvenu' that would rise to importance must have ancestors. Every nation of antiquity, from the Egyptians downwards, affected to trace its origin to the gods. It was not enough even for the Divine Founder of Christianity to appeal to the witness of His own miracles, or His own prophecies; it was of the essence of His system that its lineage could be deduced regularly from the Old

Testament, as its legitimate offspring or fulfilment. Mohammed could not have failed to see that this was the strong point of the Christian Church; the one brandished aloft immemorially by its champions in their conflicts with heretics; the one which heretics could never get over, or arrogate for themselves. Accordingly, to the Law, and to the Gospel, he went boldly for his own credentials; how then can we expect to hear him speak ill of either the one or the other? He gets all that he can out of them; he glosses over all that he finds inconvenient in either of them, just as a man does flaws in his pedigree. While he rejects the Divinity of our Lord, he does not set up his own; it is enough to have represented Christ as his own immediate forerunner; he may well leave his hearers to draw their own conclusions on the transcendental character of his mission.

§ 49. *Mohammed as a Civiliser and a De-civiliser.*

Of his system, as propounded in the Koran, it is not necessary to say much, after what has been observed by way of preface. It could never have succeeded so well, or been adopted so extensively, had it not contained many noble precepts, appealing to some of the deepest instincts in the heart of man; cherishing and feeding his aspirations, even though not always opposing his passions. The oracles of Ancient Greece themselves could never have maintained their popularity, had they not preached virtue to the extent they did. On the subject of slavery and polygamy, and in connection with the law of retaliation, it is far more in harmony with Oriental debasement than with Christian civilisation, especially in the West. But let us look at its effects upon mankind historically. Mohammed may have been a civiliser of the uncivilised, but he has been much more successful as an unciviliser of the civilised, especially where the teaching of the Koran has superseded that of the Gospel. He has, certainly, proved more of a scourge than a regenerator; and to have improved the condition of Hindoos or Negroes is

but small compensation for having extinguished the last embers of civilisation in the Greek Empire. It may not, perhaps, be fair to charge Mohammed with the barbarities and inhumanities of the Turkish Empire, but that empire was founded, and still exists, on his principles. The Turks can have been, originally, no worse barbarians than the Goths and Vandals, Franks and Sclavonians, whom Christianity converted, and out of them formed the unsurpassed nationalities of Modern Europe. We hear a great deal of the benefits conferred upon science by the Moors and Arabs. Did they do more than steal the sacred fire from others whom they displaced in Egypt and North-western Africa, to let it go out again, when it wanted feeding and cherishing, because there was nothing in their religion that it could feed upon? Or was it intercourse with Christians that really caused Moors and Arabs to cultivate science, and take to letters? Or, again, how many Moors and Arabs may not have been Christians, professed or in disguise? It seems to me that neither of these considerations has hitherto been sufficiently weighed, or looked into. The Saracens, it is well known, overran Western Asia and Northern Africa; but what became of the Christian populations of those lands? It by no means appears that they were extirpated, or even made to abjure their religion. 'The articles of the surrender of Jerusalem[203] were drawn up in writing by Omar,' says Mr. W. Irving, 'and served

[203] *Life of Mahomet*, p. 121, Tauchnitz Ed. They were these:—'The Christians were to build no new churches in the surrendered territory. The church-doors were to be set open to travellers, and free egress permitted to Mohammedans by day and night. The bells should only toll, and not ring; and no crosses should be erected on the churches, nor publicly shown in the streets. The Christians should not teach the Koran to their children, nor speak openly of their religion, nor attempt to make proselytes, nor hinder their kinsfolk from embracing Islam. They should not assume the Moslem dress, either caps, slippers, or turbans; nor part their hair like Moslems, but should be always distinguished by girdles. They should not use the Arabian language in inscriptions on their signets, nor salute after the Moslem fashion, nor be called by Moslem surnames. They should rise on the entrance of a Moslem, and remain standing until he should be seated. They should entertain every Moslem traveller three days gratis. They should sell no wine, bear no arms, and use no saddle in riding; neither should they have any domestic who had been in Moslem service.'

afterwards as a model for the Moslem leaders in other conquests.' They imply degradation, but not extirpation, or even apostasy. How, in short, could their Moslem conquerors have done without them? They wanted wives, servants, traders, artificers, tillers of the ground. They were a mere army themselves. Besides, they were by no means as intolerant at first as they became afterwards, or as the Turks have since proved. What they ambitionated was to make their creed the dominant one, and to uproot idolatry. Against Christianity they harboured no such spite, till the first crusade had embittered their relations. Yet, in the midst of bloodshed, Saladin can be courteous and conciliatory to our own Hubert bishop of Salisbury,[204] and Meledin to S. Francis.[205] Where is the proof, therefore, that Moors or Arabs owed their refinement or advance in science to their religion as such? Aggrandised by conquests, and become rich, and powerful, they would naturally draw the talent of all nations towards them; and how often is it, in the annals of literature, that, under cover of an Arab name, we find a concealed or unsuspected Christian! Said-ben-Batrik, the annalist, better known to us as Eutychius, was Christian patriarch of Alexandria in the tenth century. George Elmacin lived amongst Mohammedans in Syria, but was a Christian both by birth and profession; and his History of the Saracens, from the death of Mohammed to the twelfth century, is among the best. The well-known author of the 'History of Dynasties,' Abulfarajus, began life as a Jew, and ended as a Christian primate. Al-Wassan-al Fasi, better known as Leo Africanus, author of 'Lives of the Arabian Philosophers,' abjured Mohammedanism in the sixteenth century. That Ebn Roshd (Averroes) and Jhu Sina (Avicenna) never turned Christians may be true enough, but was their philosophy due to or compatible with Mohammedanism;[206] and were they not

[204] Hook's *Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. ii. p. 594.

[205] Butler's *Lives of the Saints—Life of S. Francis*, Oct. 4.

[206] 'Philosophy was, in truth, more implacably oppugnant, a more flagrant heresy, to Islam than to Medieval Christianity.'—*Latin Christianity*, b. xiv. c. iii. p. 441. Chapters 1 and 2 of b. iv., *On Mohammed, his Creed, and Successors*, do not strike me as containing any new ideas.

themselves created by the intellectual outburst of Christian Europe in the twelfth century?[207] We may take a glance at the Turkish Empire, and be still more strengthened in our conclusions. Who compose the mind and intelligence of that vast territory but its Christian subjects? At the present day they are Christians undisguisedly, because Europe has now got the upper hand. Nine-tenths of the pashas, however, are still compelled to dissemble or disown their Christianity. But from the days of Mohammed II. downwards, how often has the grand-vizier or prime minister been a Christian slave, and the viziers of the cupola proselytised Christians of humble birth? For how long a time were not the janissaries or household troops exclusively Christian youths or renegades, recruited from every fifth male child of the Christian population?[208] Finally, what better account can be given of it now that it has no janissaries? Has it not existed entirely for the last century or more upon Christian sufferance, protected by Christian diplomacy and Christian arms against Christian domination? In A.D. 1721, Jeremiah, Patriarch of Constantinople,[209] from his slough-of-despond in that city, delegated high privileges and independence to the Church of all the Russias. In it, or rather the mighty nationality composing it, the Nemesis of Oriental Christendom is assuming more and more colossal proportions every day, preparatory to its final swoop. The successor of Mohammed II., in the opinion of all men, may look forward to the fate of Constantine Palæologus on the first convenient opportunity. Meanwhile civilisation, impelled by Christianity, has been steadily running away from Mohammedanism in the West; the nations of Europe combined against it as their worst foe, and effectually stemmed its course. It never

[207] There are doubts about the age of Avicenna; but there can be no doubt but that both Arabian philosophy and literature owed its chief merits to the various schools of ancient Greece. Arabs and Europeans ran a race in the study of the classics—can there be a shadow of a doubt which has won?

[208] Mr. Dyer's *Modern Europe*, vol. i. introd. p. 10; Hallam's *Middle Ages*, c. vi. ad f.

[209] See his encyclic, authorising the recognition, by the whole Œcumenical Church, of 'the most Holy Governing Synod.'—Mouravieff's *Hist.* p. 287, Mr. Blackmore's *Tr.*

could make proselytes there at any time; it has been compelled to disgorge its conquests there, one by one. Across the Atlantic it has never presumed to venture, either in the character of belligerent or missionary. The Cross has had its own way all along in America.

With these facts before us, how can any one hesitate to limit the civilising influences of Mohammedanism to those countries where no better civilisation had been known previously, and to maintain its anti-civilising influences wherever it has displaced or enslaved Christianity? In attempting to supplant Christianity, it has either signally failed, or superinduced barbarism; for attempting to supplant idolatry, which it has done more successfully, it may merit some thanks even from Christians. 'Never was Mohammed greater[210] than on that memorable day when he rode on his camel seven times round the Caba, and had the 360 idols overthrown and crushed beneath his feet, saying, "The truth has come, let falsehood disappear!"' Never was integrity of purpose more deservedly rewarded than when the idol of Somnaut[211] yielded its 'magnificent outpourings of diamonds, and pearls, and rubies beyond number,' to its destroyer Mahmood!

§ 50. *Excuse for Mohammedanism.—Christian Sects in the East.*

We have but one more point to examine—the plea so often put forward in the Koran, in self-justification,—the divisions of Christendom: 'Into disputes they fell; some of them believed, and some were infidels.' Here it would be impossible to assert that Mohammed belied facts. Nothing can be more sickening than the aspect of the Eastern Church in the fifth and sixth centuries, or subsequently to the Fourth General Council. S. Gregory Nazianzenus had given no very flattering account of the Eastern bishops of his own day.[212]

[210] *Christian Remembrancer* for January, 1855, p. 124.

[211] Ibid. Comp. Gibbon, c. lvii.

[212] See the passages from his works collected by Gieseler, *E. H.* per. ii. div. i. § 103, in the notes.

S. Hilary had spoken of their gross ignorance and unworthy feuds in Asia Minor, the place of his exile.[213] But look at the horrible excesses that were attendant upon the elevation of Timothy Ælurus to the see of Alexandria, of Peter the Fuller to the see of Antioch, and of Acacius to the see of Constantinople! What a world of discord and profanity is disclosed in those fell names of Theopaschites, Acephali, Julianists, Apthartodocetæ, Docetæ, Gajanists, Phantasiastæ, Severians, Pthartolatræ, Ktistolatræ, Corrupticolæ, Theodosians, Agnoetæ, Mopsuestians, Origenists, Monothelites—all of whom sprang into existence almost simultaneously, anathematising each other, persecuting each other, murdering each other![214] Had Mohammed lived on into the iconoclastic controversy, he would have found, on both sides, even stronger proofs than these of the utter prostration and degradation of the Eastern mind. So many centuries of intricate theological controversies had fairly exhausted it. Had he lived till then, however, he would have seen equally the division of his own votaries into Sheeāhs and Sūnnees, opposing each other with no less virulence and deadly hate than either Jews or Christians had done before them: the Sheeāhs, who regarded Ali as the vicar of God, and execrated those who had stepped in between him and his inheritance; and the Sūnnees, who revered the memories of Abubekr, Omar, and Othman, his supplanters. Other divisions ensued as time went on, and fresh conquests were made. By A.D. 710 the whole of North Africa had been gained, and Spain invaded; within fourteen months, Tarik had established Saracen ascendency in the latter country, from the columns of Hercules to the Pyrenees. But

[213] *De Synod.* c. 63: 'Non peregrina loquor, neque ignorata scribo; audivi ac vidi vitia præsentium, non laicorum, sed episcoporum. Nam absque episcopo Eleusio' (and he was a Semi-Arian) 'et paucis cum eo, ex majori parte Asianæ decem provinciæ, intra quas consisto, verè Deum nesciunt. Atque utinam penitùs nescirent; cum procliviore enim veniâ ignorarent, quam obtrectarent.' Again, c. 90: 'Vereor, fratres, Orientis hæreses, in tempora singula pullulantes.'

[214] As Dean Milman graphically says: 'Throughout Asiatic Christendom it was the same wild struggle. Bishops deposed quietly; or, where resistance was made, the two factions fighting in the streets, in the churches; cities, even the holiest places, ran with Christian blood.'—*Latin Christianity*, b. iii. c. i. p. 230, 2nd ed.

all these advantages were counterbalanced by the fierce rivalry of the Ommiades, Abbassides, and Fatimites, or white, black, and green factions: caliphate was arrayed against caliphate, till ultimately no less than seventy-two different sects of Mohammedans could be counted up.

It was for this reason more than any other[215] that the tide of conquest was so often checked, rolled back, or otherwise diverted, till the Saracens themselves had to make way for a new race, who domineered over them as well as over Christians, and for whom the glory of the capture of Constantinople and subjugation of the whole Greek Empire, was reserved in their most warlike tribe, the Ottoman Turks. But even their conquests had wellnigh melted away before the Mogul.[216] 'Into disputes they fell; some of them believed, and some were infidels,' is a charge, therefore, to which the followers of Mohammed must plead guilty, and not the followers of Christ only. The Koran, no less than the Bible, has its rival schools of interpretation, its orthodox, and its heretics; neither can Mohammed be said to have proved, historically, a greater benefactor to mankind than Christ. Historically, there can be no comparison between the humanising influences of the two religions; just as, personally, there can be no comparison between the lives of Jesus Christ and Mohammed. If the Gospels are true, the precepts of Christ are seen ideally embodied in His own perfect life; the Koran would be very different even from what it is, if it affected to be a mirror of the life of its prophet.[217] I have called Mohammed Antichrist, not as in any true sense rivalling Christ, but as having set himself above Christ, and plotted to sup-

[215] See Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, c. lii., from A. D. 841 to 960, and c. lvii., on the invasion of the Roman Empire by the Turks.

[216] Gibbon, ibid. c. lxv.

[217] Mohammed, five times or more, added to the Koran to justify or palliate his own acts.—See Irving's *Life*, pp. 121, 149, 151, 181, 238. He far exceeded the license of his own laws in the matter of polygamy and concubinage. Nor could the law of retaliation, as practised by him, have well been more savage or more extortionate.—Ibid. pp. 133, 138-9, 146, 178. Even the cold-blooded massacre of the Koraidites must have had his countenance.—Ibid. p. 163. Imagine what the Gospels would be did such cases occur in them!

plant Him. On his mode of doing it I have dwelt sufficiently. In illustration of his claim to that title, let me conclude by quoting one of the earliest abjurations on record in his behalf:—

'I renounce your society,' said Romanus (to the Christians of Bosra), 'both in this world, and in the world to come. And I deny Him that was crucified, and whosoever worships Him; and I choose God for my Lord, Islam for my faith, Mecca for my temple, the Moslems for my brethren, and Mohammed for my prophet, who was sent to lead us into the right way, and to exalt the true religion in spite of those who join partners with God.'[218] These were terms of communion that no previous heresiarch would have countenanced or exacted. Still, as I have said before, even these words show that Mohammed had not set up himself as God.

§ 51. *Mohammed and Luther compared.—Their Points of Resemblance.*

Passing immediately from Mohammed to Luther, nobody can, I think, fail to be struck with the strange resemblance that there is of one to the other, both as individuals, and in their relations to the age of the Church in which they lived. Luther did not set up as antichrist—far from it—nor Mohammed as antichurch, at least in intention (*εἰ μὴ κατὰ συμβεβηκός*); but as decidedly as Mohammed played the part of antichrist in the East, Luther played the part of antichurch in the West. Even in character, in nationality, in time and mode of appearance, they exhibit some striking parallelisms. Both were remarkable for their keen practical knowledge of mankind in general, and of Western and Eastern idiosyncrasies still more. They knew exactly what line to advocate; how

[218] Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, c. li., in his account of the siege of Bosra, A.D. 632–3. Further on, c. lvii., speaking of the selection of Nice by Soliman for his palace and fortress, the historian, as it were, exults while he writes: '*The Divinity of Christ was denied and derided in the same temple in which it had been pronounced by the first general synod of the Catholics.*'

far to go; and beyond what point they would not be followed. Both were remarkable for their earnest temperament and indomitable resolution and simplicity of life; yet both had strong sensual passions likewise. Their origin, and in some respects their progress, was in marked contrast. Mohammed sprang from the most intellectual and subtle of Eastern races; Luther from the most plodding and practical amongst Westerns. All the theological heresies of the East were symbolised in Mohammed—all the anthropological heresies of the West in Luther. As no European nationality ever embraced Mohammedanism, so neither has any Eastern church, up to the present time, done otherwise than protest against Protestantism. Both Mohammed and Luther affected to have converse with spirits; to be fighting for the integrity of the Scriptures; to be waging a war, the one for God, the other for Christ alone. Both affected to be inculcating a purer and holier standard than that of their own age. Mohammed began life as a 'Hanyf,'—a 'reformed,' or 'puritan;' it was that very title which was appropriated by Luther, and by his predecessors, and by his followers, from the first. But it was not long before Mohammed had carried polygamy in his own case to a point beyond what even Eastern manners would tolerate; and Luther, Melancthon, and Bucer disgraced themselves for ever in the eyes of Europe by permitting the Landgrave of Hesse to take a second wife.[219] Similarly, both purported to be setting humanity free from bondage, while both advanced theories annihilative both of the freedom of the will, and of all moral responsibility. To be sure, fatalism in the West has been always much more speculated upon than acted upon: in the East, so much more prone to speculate than to practise, it has become the rule of life. Finally, as Mohammed had his rivals and opponents in the fanatics Al-Aswad and Moseilma, so Luther saw himself surpassed in violence by Munzer, John of Leyden, and the Anabaptists. As Mohammed had for his lieutenants Ali, Abubekr, Omar, and

[219] See the 'Traduction des Pièces,' &c., at the end of the sixth book of Bossuet's *Histoire des Variations*. Divorces, moreover, came in with Protestantism.

Othman; so Luther had for his fellow-reformers Zwinglius and Bucer, Melancthon and Calvin. But the same animosities exhibited themselves, sooner or later, in both camps; and in the feuds between Sheeāhs and Sūnnees, we may read a very counterpart to those disputes which arose between the Lutherans proper and the Reformed.

§ 52. *Grand difference between Mohammed and Luther.—Luther Antichurch, not Antichrist.*

In one fundamental respect alone were the Arab seer and the German reformer diametrically opposed: the one repudiating, the other—with all his enmity to the Church—with all his might supporting, the Divine claims of its Founder. Behold, in this undeniable contrast between Protestantism and Mohammedanism, an irresistible argument of the intrinsic excellence of that noble religion which so many shortsighted empirics would make men believe that they can do without, and not fare the worse! Humanity has become stagnant under Mohammedanism based upon the Koran; under Protestantism, based upon the Bible, it has only progressed too fast—become too civilised, too self-confident. The strength of Protestantism has been its adherence to the religion of Christ; the bane of Protestantism has been its antagonism to that institution of Christ by which He designed His religion to be maintained and extended upon earth—without which it had become long since extinct. Luther stands out in as glorious contrast to Mohammed in the former respect, as the history of Protestant Europe and America since his day to that of the Turkish Empire.

I am far from asserting that, even in the latter respect, he is to be charged with all the excesses and aberrations of Modern Protestantism. I have said that Luther was no antichrist, though he was antichurch, every bit of him. Let me explain in what. First, Luther did not assail any one of the theological articles of the creed; nor, in fact, have any of the Luthero-Calvinistic churches, as such, ever done so to the present day. Thus much is as expressly acknowledged by

Moehler[220] as it was by Bossuet. More than this, Luther's principle of justification by faith is founded upon Christ completely, and upon Christ alone. It is faith in Christ, neither more nor less, and no other—not even in God, not even in Christ divested of His mediatorial office—that he represents as assuring our justification. Thirdly, faith, according to Luther, is the gift of God, and not a mere virtue to be acquired by our own efforts. This, again, has perhaps been acknowledged by his opponents. Fourthly, it is only one who has been made a Christian that can have such justifying faith in his estimate. It is this part of his system which has not been generally acknowledged and placed to his credit. Christian baptism appears to be necessarily presupposed in his idea of justifying faith; he would not have allowed that it could be possessed by a Pagan or Mohammedan; that it could make him a Christian who was not one before; that it could be attained to, as such, by any but the baptized Christian. He was as hostile to Anabaptists as any Catholic could have been.[221] Neither, indeed, had he any reason for disparaging

[220] Introd. to the *Symbolism*. In the preface to its first edition, p. xvi., he goes so far as to say that the contest between Catholics and Protestants 'sprang out of the most earnest endeavours of both parties to uphold the truth—the pure and genuine Christianity—in all its integrity.' And this is certainly the moral to be drawn from his own great work.

[221] On this one point the language of all the Reformed Confessions is the same. See *Sylloge Confess.* Oxon. 1828, 8vo.:—

Confess. Helvet. p. 80: 'Unus est baptismus in Ecclesiâ Dei, et satis est semel baptizari vel initiari Deo. . . . Etenim baptizari in nomine Christi est inscribi, initiari, et recipi in fœdus atque familiam adeoque in hæreditatem filiorum Dei . . . purgari item a sordibus peccatorum, et donari variâ Dei gratiâ ad vitam novam et innocentem.'

Ibid. *Summaria Confess.* p. 106: 'In baptismo aqua signum est, et res ipsa regeneratio, adoptioque in populum Dei.'

Augustan. (A.D. 1531) p. 126: 'De baptismo docent, quòd sit necessarius ad salutem, quòdque per baptismum offeratur gratia Dei.'

Ibid. (A.D. 1540) p. 171: 'De baptismo docent, quòd necessarius sit ad salutem, tanquam ceremonia a Christo instituta. Et quòd per baptismum offeratur gratia Dei.'

Confess. Saxon. p. 278: 'Docemus igitur necessarium esse baptismum, et semel tantum baptizamus singulos. . . . Retinemus et infantium baptismum . . . nec judicamus hunc morem tantum otiosam ceremoniam esse; sed verè tunc a Deo recipi et sanctificari infantes, quia tunc inseruntur ecclesiæ, et ad tales promissio pertinet.'

Confess. Belgic. p. 348: 'His de

baptism in order to push his theory to its utmost limits. For of all Christian ordinances baptism is the one that has fewest conditions attached to it. It may be administered by women as well as men, laymen as well as clerics, heretics as well as orthodox. Any water will serve for it; any form of words, so that it be in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is held sufficient. Any age, any sex, is capable of receiving it. Its recipients need not be conscious of any dispositions at all, provided that they are not conscious of any adverse dispositions. There is next to nothing of church in all this; it conducts to Christ as immediately as faith itself—which it must often precede; for, though a sacrament, it requires no active cooperation on the part of the Church whatever for its valid administration. One who has been cast out of the Church may administer it, so that it cannot be cancelled even by the Supreme Head of the Church.[222]

§ 53. *Subject continued.—Faith the first of Subjective Dispositions.*

Luther, therefore, had no cause for quarrelling with Christian baptism in order to be as antichurch as he pleased; and they must have cold hearts indeed that can refuse their sympathies to that magnificent burst of his,[223] in which Almighty

causis credimus omnem hominem qui vitam æternam consequi cupiat, debere unico baptismo, id est, semel tantum baptizari.

[222] *Council of Trent*, sess. vii. can. iv.: 'If any one saith that the baptism which is even given by heretics in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church doth, is not true baptism, let him be anathema.' It said this while condemning the Protestant party as heretics.

[223] 'Benedictus Deus et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui secundum divitias misericordiæ suæ hoc unicum sacramentum servavit in Ecclesiâ suâ illibatum et incontaminatum a constitutionibus hominum, liberumque fecit omnibus gentibus, omniumque hominum ordinibus. Nec passus est et ipsum teterrimis quæstûs et impurissimis superstitionum portentis opprimi: eo scilicet consilio usus, quod parvulos qui avaritiæ et superstitionis capaces non sunt, eo voluit initiari, et simplicissimâ fide Verbi Sui sanctificari, quibus et potissimum hodiè prodest baptismus.' Further on he quotes, approvingly, those who hold, 'Baptismum esse primum et fundamentum omnium sacramentorum, sine quo nullum queat aliorum

God is solemnly blessed for having caused this one sacrament to be perpetuated in its pristine simplicity, from tenderness to the innocent babes that are its most frequent recipients. From the principle that it could never be repeated, Luther deduced that its effects could never be lost—that it must be held to, or returned to, through life. That is, he considered penance, which had been called 'a second plank after shipwreck,' to be no more than a return to the first, or baptism. Nothing can more clearly illustrate the logical basis of his whole theory than this position of his. The sacrament of baptism could be administered without any hierarchy at all; the sacrament of penance, as such, involved a hierarchy. He took his stand upon the first of objective ordinances, and the first of subjective dispositions: on the former, because he could do so without incurring any direct obligations to the visible Church; on the latter, because it was the principle that brought him at once to Christ. Evidently, the same considerations that recommended to him baptism among rites, recommended faith to him among subjective dispositions. It went direct to Christ as its object, without any reference to the Church. Repentance was part of the sacrament of penance, and in a manner presupposed it. Hope was vague without faith; charity was dead without works. Of works there were literally none—at least of good works—but what the Church had laid her hands on and appropriated. Prayer, fasting, almsgiving, the corporal works of mercy, pilgrimages, austerities, vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience;—all these the Church had dogmatised, both on the manner of

obtineri.' Further on: 'Ita vides quam dives sit homo Christianus, sive baptizatus, qui etiam volens non potest perdere salutem suam quantiscunque peccatis, nisi nolit credere. Nulla enim peccata eum possunt damnare, nisi sola incredulitas.' Still baptism is presupposed in all this. Further on: 'A fide sacramentorum tibi incipiendum est, sine ullis operibus, si salvus fieri velis; fidem autem ipsa sequentur opera, tantùm ne vilem habeas fidem, quæ opus est omnium excellentissimum et arduissimum; quo solo, etiam si cæteris omnibus carere cogereris, servaberis. Est enim opus Dei, non hominis, sicut Paulus docet; cætera nobiscum et per nos operatur; hoc unicum in nobis, et sine nobis operatur.' . . . Still we must have been baptised first.—*De Captiv. Babyl. and De Sacram. Bapt.*

doing, and on the merit which attached to them when done. Good works, in short, had become ceremonial; like those of the law, so interwoven with the ecclesiastical way of viewing them, that it was hopeless to attempt their disentanglement. It was easier to cut the knot, and be quit of them all, than to unravel it. On the other hand, faith stood out against the clear sky, as at the first, in its pristine simplicity, and reposed upon God, not man. Without it nobody could be saved; with it who need despair? Repentance, hope, charity, obedience could make no man acceptable before God who was not a believer in Christ; but he who sincerely believed in Christ, though he never performed a single good work but that one, might be saved. Good works therefore, as practised and understood in those days, were buried beneath the same encumbrances that the other sacraments were, from his point of view, and were accordingly discarded by Luther equally with those sacraments; while faith was seized by him as possessing the same simplicity, the same independence, as baptism, and with baptism made the keystone of his system. And he appealed to the plain text of the Bible, interpreted by the inner sense of baptized Christians,[224] in proof of it. Baptism was the one indispensable ordinance for making men Christians, and faith the one indispensable principle that could never be laid aside through life. All the other virtues were useless, unless rooted in faith; all the other sacraments inoperative, unless baptism had preceded them. Nobody can deny that this was a position that might have been maintained with perfect orthodoxy, had it not been assumed for a sinister end—namely, that of unchurching the Church. Had Luther,

[224] 'Those are far from duly appreciating Luther's views and spirit who imagine that he absolutely believed that he could discover the true sense of Scripture by an historico-grammatical interpretation. Nothing was more alien to him—nothing more at variance with his whole system. The very notion that, by human exertions, we can win and appropriate to ourselves the knowledge of Divine things, he held to be the acme of ungodliness . . . In his writings to the Bohemians . . . he expressly declares, that the believer is the freest judge of all his teachers, *since he is inwardly instructed by God alone.*'—Moehler's *Symb.* vol. ii. pp. 89, 86, Robertson's *Tr.*

instead of rending Christendom, withdrawn from it; had he organised a gigantic emigration, and, grieved and indignant at the corruptions which he saw around him, crossed the ocean, Bible in hand, with 20,000 followers, men, women, and children, a mixed multitude, and settled in some distant and unoccupied continent—Australia, for instance—his descendants might have lived on in perfect good faith there till now, not only without ceasing to be Christians, but without deviating in the slightest degree from the most rigid orthodoxy. According to the supposition, they would have had no priests, and therefore no sacraments but one—no authoritative teaching, no obligatory ceremonial. But, through the instrumentality of lay-baptism, every successive generation might have been made Christian, and all individuals among them might have lived and died in the faith of Christ, keeping His commandments, as far as could be collected from the Sacred Text, and as best they were able. Suppose Luther, instead of preaching revolt, to have done this, and no real intercourse to have taken place between Europe and Australia till the nineteenth century, would the Catholic world have saluted his descendants as heretics or schismatics? Or would not rather the maxim of St. Thomas—'Articulus necessitatis sacramentum excludit'—have vindicated them against either designation, even though their administration of baptism had come to be somewhat rude, and their definition of faith somewhat vague? Had the Pitcairn Islanders not been children of mutineers, and the New-England pilgrims implicated in no previous revolt against authority, their histories would have attracted sympathy much more widely than they have, and been so many cases in point. Now the above was, more or less, the actual position assumed by Protestantism in presence —in open defiance—of the Catholic Church. It deliberately walked out of the choir, and took up a position in the nave. I say more or less, because some distinction must be made further on between Protestant bodies themselves. It was this revolutionary determination that involved Luther and his theory—not necessarily heterodox in its origin—in a world of errors and contradictions, respecting sin, respecting freewill,

respecting faith and baptism themselves—the inner as well as the outer man, subjective as well as objective anthropology. To specify them would be to rewrite Moehler, who has subjected them, one by one, to the analysis of philosophy, and exposed their unsoundness.

§ 54. *Errors of Luther weighed against Corruptions in the Church.*

The only question, therefore, that can be raised is—Had the Church become so hopelessly corrupt in the days of Luther as to justify his fundamental position, that there was no Church at all to belong to but what could be reconstructed, with baptism for its determining ordinance, and faith for its exclusive principle? This is the true question at issue: and it will readily be seen, after the experience of 300 years, that it must be given against Luther, and for the Church, though it is not by any means one that is free from difficulty. Had Luther had the right wholly on his side, it is inconceivable that he should have fallen into those gross aberrations and bewilderments of which it is impossible to acquit him and his followers. Had the Church been wholly unimpeachable, it is inconceivable that Protestantism should have been so long and so often, even providentially, upheld as it has been. A.D. 1588 saw the defeat of the Spanish Armada; A.D. 1688 the expulsion of James II., just as Catholicism had been all but restored in England; A.D. 1788 the commencement of the French Revolution, which had wellnigh swept not merely Catholicism, but Christianity, from every country in Europe but England. America was discovered by Catholics, but at the end of 300 years they are found there in a vast minority.

We must beware of arguing on these topics as though we had a simple question to deal with. As I have said before, there was the problem of subjective anthropology to be resolved by the Church; and there were the inductive sciences to be recast, as the deductive sciences had been previously, for redeemed man, by the light of the Gospel. Both were, from the nature of the case, disintegrating processes: men

were thrown back by both upon their individuality. Inductive science could not advance but by experiment and observation, involving far greater freedom from authority than had as yet been known; and as for subjective qualifications and responsibilities, as soon as ever attention could be concentrated upon them, it is easy to see how not merely personal, but national, susceptibilities would be set fermenting. The Spaniard or Italian, with his uncontrollable imagination, would far sooner part with his individuality than with his splendid ceremonial: the phlegmatic Englishman would sooner pray with his hands over his eyes, or his eyes closed, all his life, than surrender his independence of thought and action, or be tied to any theory that his own conscience could not accept honestly. Behind, and besides all this, there was the undeniable fact of immense corruption in the Church, so great and manifold as to shake the belief of men in her Divine credentials. Luther both saw and felt it. We, happily, can only go back to it in thought, and by means of books. Yet even Luther might have taken a much more philosophical view of it all, even then, had he been more of a thinker. He might have learned from Our Lord that Jerusalem had not ceased to be the holy city because Scribes and Pharisees had gotten the upper hand there. He might have learned from Eusebius that even the Primitive Church required to be reminded by persecutions of its heavenward aim. He might have learnt, by comparing the ninth and tenth centuries with the thirteenth, that the Church had been buried under, had risen up from, and shaken off far greater horrors and enormities than any that he saw around him. Rome might have presented a picture the reverse of austerity and faith unfeigned under Leo X.; but, compared with what it had been under the Counts of Tusculum, it surely might deserve to be called the centre of civilisation and of high Christian art? When Luther visited Rome, in A.D. 1510, Bramanti was laying the foundations of that marvel of Christendom which Lord Byron has so finely apostrophised,[225] as—

[225] *Childe Harold*, canto iv. cliv.

> Standing alone—with nothing like to thee—
> Worthiest of God, the holy and the true—
> Since Zion's desolation, when that He
> Forsook his former city, what could be,
> Of earthly structures, in his honour piled,
> Of a sublimer aspect? Majesty,
> Power, glory, strength, and beauty, all are aisled
> In this eternal ark of worship undefiled!

In A.D. 1520, while Luther was procuring his own excommunication by the most indulgent of popes, Raphael was expiring in that city, and bequeathing to universal Christendom his immortal picture of the Transfiguration.

In point of fact, things had seen their worst, and were beginning to mend, when Luther appeared on the stage; and even among those who opposed him, there were many who both acknowledged and mourned over the corruptions which they could not eradicate, as sincerely as he did.

§ 55. *Difficulties in the way of Reform everywhere.—Especially in the Church.*

How then did it happen that the remedy was not applied more promptly and more effectually to the disease? Because there is always, in every society, and not by any means exclusively in the Church, a party that is interested and bent upon keeping things as they are, be they ever so reprehensible, and opposed to making any change, be it ever so beneficial. No system—not even the Church, not even the Cloister—can go on for long without requiring to be recast, reformed, or modified according to its altered circumstances. The business is, what alterations are to be made, and who is to make them? Happy those institutions that can or will reform themselves, or, in the opposite case, can be compelled to do so by constituted authority from without—in the way in which our universities, our public schools, our various corporate bodies in England have been of late years, by dint of pressure through the Crown! From the nature of the case, the universal church can only be reformed from within, now that there is no universal empire; and when one part of it

is both willing and anxious to be reformed, another part of it may step in and deprecate and prevent change of any kind. From the very nature of the case, too, the argument against change is stronger in the Church than elsewhere; not merely because some of its institutions, and all its articles of faith, assume to be from God, but because, in most cases, its worst abuses are found entwined round some of its holiest rites. In the Church, as elsewhere, reformers have their persecutions to go through, and all real successes are achieved by patience and perseverance—not revolt. It is so no less in the Cloister. S. Benedict had his life attempted by the monks of Vicovara, who had elected him for their abbot; Savonarola was burnt in the city where he had for so many years preached Christ crucified. The reforms of S. Teresa involved her in undying enmity from one branch of the Carmelites; S. Charles Borromeo was fired upon and wounded by one of those 'Humiliati' whose excesses he had determined to check; S. Philip Neri, the apostle of Rome, as he is justly styled, was threatened with imprisonment by the papal vicar of that city, 'if he did not leave his new ways of proceeding.'[226] He it was, above all others, who had been advocating the practice of frequent communions. The sternest and most zealous of the reforming popes experienced no better treatment at the hands of their degenerate subjects. Adrian VI.[227] was thought to have died through the wilfulness or negligence of his own physician. On news of his death the house of Macerata was decorated with garlands, and with this vile inscription, 'Liberatori urbis et orbis.' Buried in the very Church of

[226] Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, May 26.

[227] '*La Corte di Roma* prese incredibile allegrezza della sua morte, ne fu tralasciata sorte alcuna di maledicenza, la quale posse machiare la sua memoria . . . Furono ancora composti molti versi in lode del medico Macerata, ed adornata la porta della casa sua con i rami degli arboscelli, con questo elogio "Liberatori orbis et urbis;" perchè si sapeva per certo, che il Pape era morto più presto per la poca cura ed ignorantia del detto medico. Perchè essendo egli messo in S. Pietro in un sepolchro aposticcio tra Pio II. et Pio III. vi era stato scritto in lettere di un palmo "Impius inter pios." Il che da tutti era letto con grandissima risa.' Conclave nel quale fu creato Papa Clemente VII.—Rawl. *MSS. Ital.* vol. xv. fol. 1, in the Bodleian Library.

St. Peter, between Pius II. and III., his tomb was lampooned, in large letters, 'Impius inter pios.' All Raynaldus can hear of him[228] is, that his character was irreproachable, and that his election was reported to have been by Divine choice. Paul IV., who 'lived and moved in his reforms and his inquisition,' as Ranke says of him, was an object of malediction through life, and at his death his statue was thrown down and broken in pieces by the infuriated mob.[229] Between reactionary subordinates, and sovereigns of such equivocal characters and conflicting aims as Henry VII. and VIII., Francis I. and Henri II., Charles V. and Philip II., it is easy to see that the most thorough-going popes of that date, with all their infallibility, were never omnipotent; while their very office tended to make strong conservatives of them, one and all, especially when the faith was assailed. Let facts tell their own tale.

§ 56. *Corruptions of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.—Extenuating Circumstances.*

As little can it be denied that the glories of the thirteenth century were due to the vigorous reforms inaugurated by S. Gregory VII. and his successors, as that the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries witnessed a very extensive declension of manners and discipline, though by no means of civilisation. Even on the former head, were I writing a church-history, there would be some extenuating circumstances to be produced in behalf of a period during which upwards of fifty universities were founded in all parts of Europe.[230] Gorgeous cathedrals of the stamp of Orvieto, Sienna, Milan, Strasburg,

[228] *Annal.* A.D. 1523, No. 112 *et seq.*

[229] 'Quanquam religionis tuendæ et conservandæ studio, clarus super omnes retro Pontifices haberetur, multorum tamen sermonibus ejus eximia virtus, quæ improbis severa nimis videbatur, lacerata fuit. Ac tunc maxime, quum post ejus obitum, Romani populi furor in ejus statuam nuper erectam, excitato tumultu . . . debacchatur,' &c.—Ciaconius. *Hist. Pontif.* vol. iii. p. 813, who adds significantly, 'Tanti refert, in quæ tempore vel optimi cujusque virtus incidat.'

[230] Alzog. *Hist. de l'Église*, § 251, note; where they are all enumerated.

Winchester (as restored by William of Wykeham), Toledo, and Seville erected; professorial chairs for the study of Hebrew and Chaldee, Greek and Arabic, ordained by a General Council[231] for Rome, Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca. No less than twenty printed editions of the Bible were brought out, in High or Low German alone, between A.D. 1460 and the age of Luther;[232] upwards of 1,200 books issued, from the printing-presses of Italy alone, between A.D. 1471–80.[233] For commentators on the Bible it could boast of Tostatus, and Nicolas of Lyra; for masters of the inner life, John Tauler and Thomas à Kempis; for ideal artists, Fra Angelico and Fra Bartolomeo. It was not behindhand in men and women of the saintly graces of S. Catherine of Sienna, S. Bridget, S. Elizabeth of Portugal, S. Vincent Ferrier, and S. John Cantius; of the ardent philanthropy of Bartholomew de las Casas; of the splendid abilities of Cardinal Ximenes, or the splendid munificence of William of Wykeham and Wainflete. I am solely concerned with the causes that procured for Luther such wide sympathy—for his theory so favourable a hearing, and so long a reign.[234]

It could not but be disastrous in the extreme for Christendom when Clement V. fixed upon Avignon as his abode. It was as though the Queen of England should transfer her residence to Gibraltar or Heligoland, without abdicating her functions. Non-resident themselves, how could the Popes order absentee bishops and archbishops back to their respec-

[231] That of Vienna, A.D. 1312: see ap. Koch. *Sanct. Pragm. German.* illust. ed. 1789; Argum. *Sanct. Pragm.* c. ii. § 8.

[232] Alzog. ibid. § 286, note; where they are all enumerated.

[233] Hallam, *Hist. of Lit.* from A.D. 1400, c. ii. § 49.

[234] 'The Protestants themselves furnish an irrefragable proof of the state of manifold neglect into which the people had fallen during the fifteenth century. Never would a system of doctrine like theirs have sprung up, still less obtained such wide diffusion, had individual teachers and priests been faithful to the duties of their calling. Truly the ignorance could not have been slight, on which a system of faith like that of the Reformers was imposed as worthy of acceptance!—and thus Protestants may learn to estimate the magnitude of the evil which then oppressed the Church by the magnitude of the errors into which they themselves have fallen.' —Moehler's *Symbol.* vol. ii. p. 31, Robertson's *Tr.*

tive sees? And when bishops and archbishops might live with impunity where they pleased, what was to become, and what actually did become, of the inferior clergy? Of their own independence, as sovereigns, can any more satisfactory account be given during their sojourn in that ill-omened city? By what melancholy means was their stay there prolonged?—by what fatal schism their return signalised? To what scandals did that meeting, which was to have come off between Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII., at Savona, give rise—so humiliating to their mutual supporters, that the cardinals of both obediences combined in holding the Council of Pisa to get rid of them both? What a phenomenon was that Council, assembled without a head; and to this day neither approved nor reprobated, as Bellarmine says, though Alexander V. was indebted to it for his election! Evils of that magnitude could not possibly befall society singly. At that council,[235] and from that council downwards, men called for a reformation of the whole Church, head and members alike; and for upwards of a century and a half they called in vain. Its urgent necessity was disputed by nobody, yet unquestionably there was that delay in attending to it. When it came, was it in time to be accepted generally, or comprehensive enough to be complete? These are points which I shall hope to clear up, exclusively from authorities that none can dispute.

[235] A.D. 1409, June 10, the Archbishop of Pisa read, before the fathers there assembled, a declaration by which the cardinals promised that whoever among them should be chosen pope should continue the council, and not dissolve it, nor suffer it to be dispersed, till it had made a reformation of the Universal Church and of its present state, both in the head and members. And Alexander V. declared, in its last session, that his design had been to reform the Church there and then, in its head and members; but as so many had left, he now delayed it to the council which he had summoned for April, A.D. 1412 (*Dacherii Spicileg.* vol. i. pp. 763–853, ed. de la Barre).

§ 57. *Councils of Pisa and Constance.—Reformation of the whole Church demanded.*

The Council of Pisa was convened, as I have said, by no pope at all; the Council of Constance deposed the pope by whom it was convened, as well as his rivals. Martin V., who in his first Bull speaks of 'the canonical deposition of his predecessor by the definitive sentence of that council,' was himself elected conditionally; for in its third session (March 25, A.D. 1415), the assembled fathers had declared that they would not separate till not only the schism had been healed, but the whole Church, head and members, reformed in faith and manners.[236] Then, in its fortieth session, immediately preceding the conclave in which Martin was elected, it was decreed that the future Pope should join with the council, or with those who should be deputed by the nations, in their endeavours to reform the Church, in its head and members —among whom is especially mentioned the Court of Rome— according to the Eighteen Articles which had been presented by the nations, before that council should be dissolved.[237] What was meant by faith is not so clear from these Articles as from the fourth section of that report which was presented to the council about this time by the celebrated Cardinal d'Ailly.[238] 'De reformandis circa Religiones et Religiosos;'[239] in other words, ecclesiastical ordinances and observances.

[236] *Mansi*, tom. xxvii. p. 580.

[237] Oct. 30, A.D. 1417, *Mansi*, ibid. p. 1164.

[238] *Libellus de Emendatione Ecclesiæ.* It is in six parts, as follows:— 1. De reformandis circa totum corpus Ecclesiæ. 2. De reformandis circa ejus caput; sc. circa statum Papæ et Romanæ curiæ. 3. De reformatione principalium Ecclesiæ partium, sc. Prælatorum. 4. De reformandis circa Religiones et Religiosos. 5. De reformandis circa cæteros Ecclesiasticos. 6. De reformatione Laicorum Christianorum (Fascic. *Rev. Expet. et Fug.* ed. Brown, vol. i. p. 406 *et seq.*).

[239] His words in one place are: 'So with many other like things, concerning which it would be well to declare that they are not precepts but counsels. So with regard to the fast of Lent, moderation should be observed in respect of certain persons and certain circumstances. And because to prelates belong the special care of divine worship, they should see—with regard to the reformation therein necessary—that there should be less

Martin was consecrated and crowned Nov. 21, A.D. 1417. Within four months from that date, he had published no less than fifteen reformatory constitutions, to be incorporated into separate concordats for each nation. By the first of these, the number of cardinals is limited to twenty-four, none of whom are to be brothers or nephews, and only when the interests of the nations require it, may there be one or two more; while the fourteenth contains this memorable proviso for restricting indulgences: 'Cavebit Dominus noster Papa in futurum nimiam indulgentiarum effusionem ne vilescant.'[240] Is it too much to say that Luther might have never separated from the Church had neither of these constitutions been ever infringed?

Martin was far from satisfied even with these reforms. He held another council, that of Pavia, five years afterwards, which, in consequence of a fever, was transferred to Sienna, and then broke up without effecting its object. He informs our own Henry VI.,[241] with deep regret, that even the Council of Sienna had separated without achieving that *complete reformation* that he had been so desirous of carrying out; and that he had appointed a commission of cardinals in his own dominions, and contemplated appointing separate commissions in each kingdom elsewhere, for 'the consummation of a reformation of that kind.' In his encyclic of that same year, he informs the world generally that, lest by the breaking-up of that council the reformation of the Universal Church and of the

of tedious repetition in divine service . . . that the variety of pictures and images should not be allowed to grow any further; that so many new festivals should not be solemnised . . . that, except on the Lord's Day and the greater festivals instituted by the Church, it should be permitted to work after hearing the office, both because on festivals there is a great increase of sins in taverns, in dances, and the like revels, which idleness begets; and because the number of working days is scarce sufficient for the poor to procure the necessaries of life. That on such festivals apocryphal scriptures, new hymns and discourses, and the like gratuitous novelties should not be read to the disuse of what is old and customary in the churches. And that generally all novelty, and variety, and diversity of uses at the canonical hours, and other divine services, should be as far as possible avoided.'—Fascic. *Rev. Expet. et Fug.* ed. Brown, vol. i. p. 406 *et seq.*

[240] *Mansi*, tom. xxvii. pp. 1177–84.

[241] In A.D. 1224. *Mansi*, tom. xxviii. p. 1076.

Court of Rome should be delayed or impeded—which it was his intention to prosecute and carry out in all its parts—he had appointed Antonius bishop of Ostia, and two others, to receive memorials and suggestions, from any who might be disposed to come forward with them, in the interests of that reformation which he deemed so necessary.[242]

Was Martin a downright hypocrite? Or, is it not clear from his strong language that there was still a thorough reform wanting, and for which the promulgation of his own constitutions in the Council of Constance had proved inadequate?

§ 58. *Councils of Basil and Florence.—Nicholas V. on Papal Jurisdiction.*

I pass by the Council of Basil (or Bâle), because, though it decreed some salutary reforms, owing to its unfortunate misunderstandings with Eugenius IV., they never really became law. I pass by the Council of Florence for the present, because, though it made a vigorous effort to save the East, it decreed no reforms at all for the West. The schisms of the last seventy years had brought out a number of eminent and enlightened men—Gerson, Cardinal d'Ailly, Nicholas of Clemengis, Nicholas of Cusa, Cardinals Julian Cesarini and Piccolomini, for instance—who had worked ardently and honestly for reform likewise, but by some strange fatality all their efforts had been unavailing; and with the close of the schism, no further efforts were made in that direction. Nicholas V., indeed, did wonders for literature; and perhaps no Pope ever defined his position with more truthfulness, or greater equity, than he did in reply to the German electors, who had sent to compliment him on his accession.

'The Roman pontiffs,' he said, 'have extended their skirts too far. They have finished by robbing the other bishops of all their authority. On the other hand, the Fathers of Basil have tied up the hands of the popes too much. Yet, after all, how could it have been otherwise? Whoever begins by

[242] *Mansi*, tom. xxviii. p. 1077.

doing things unworthy of him is sure to have to put up with injustice. The man who wants to straighten a tree has often to bend it in a contrary direction. For my own part, I am firmly resolved not to encroach upon the rights of bishops, whose mission it is to have some share in the government of the Church. There is but one way by which I can hope to maintain inviolate the authority of the Pope; it is by respecting in each one the ecclesiastical power that belongs to him.'[243] Piccolomini passed much more from one extreme to another on becoming Pius II. Till A.D. 1445 he had been one of the most active opponents of Eugenius IV. among the Basil fathers. In that year he made his submission. Eighteen years afterwards, in the midst of his pontificate, he gave to the world that most remarkable document ever issued by a pope—his bull of his own 'retractations.' We may well pause for a moment over these memorable expressions. 'We never erred willingly,'[244] says the now infallible pontiff. It was this reasoning of his friend, and deeper thinker, Cardinal Julian, that had convinced him. 'You are plying me, Æneas, with deeds signed and sealed; and because I once thought as you say, you therefore suppose that I must always think so, and consider me bound by my former opinions. But it is just for this reason that we are free agents—namely, by being able to change our opinions till death. How should it not be lawful at all times to abandon error and embrace truth? I admit not only that I spoke and wrote what you say, but that I was wandering away from the truth in so doing. Now if, as you say, you followed me in my errors, and pinned your faith to the Basil fathers through my instrumentality, why do you not now follow me when I give you really good advice?' Truly we seem to be listening to a talker of our own times: but could any words more forcibly explain the perplexities under which men laboured then, or how natural it was for reactionary tendencies to succeed to so much mental excite-

[243] Ap. Koch. *Pragm. Germ.* illust. ed. 1789; *Hist. Sanct. Pragm.* c. ii. § 15.

[244] *Concil.* tom. ix. ed. Reg. p. 1449, *et seq.* It is dated April 25, 1463.

ment? Besides, now, the one preoccupation of Europe was beginning to be to resist the Turk, all-powerful with the spoils of Constantinople, and threatening to make the first see in Christendom his capital in the West, as he had already done by its second see in the East. Pius II. devoted the entire energies of his old age to avert that contingency. Had his immediate successors merely thrown themselves into his defensive schemes, they might have claimed the thanks of humanity, even though they had done nothing for church-reform.

§ 59. *Dark Period of Forty Years.—Creations of Cardinals.—Indulgences.*

As it was, what more should I say of that dark period of forty years between the death of Pius II., A.D. 1464, and the accession of Julius II., A.D. 1503, than that it was consummated by the burning of Savonarola? Even then, possibly, had he been heeded, no Luther might have been needed. Or, perhaps, had but two of the constitutions of Martin V. been maintained in their integrity, even Savonarola might not have died, nor Luther, as Luther, lived. By the first of them, as I have observed already, the ordinary number of cardinals was never to have exceeded twenty-four. Now let anybody consult Ciaconius—surely one of the most standard authorities—and he will see that the number of cardinals, when the following popes were elected, stood thus—

When	Pius II.	was elected	24
„	Paul II.	„	26
„	Sixtus IV.[245]	„	26
„	Innocent VIII.[246]	„	31
„	Alexander VI.	„	27
„	Pius III.	„	45

[245] Of him Ciaconius says (*Vit. Pontif.* s. v.): 'Nova collegia primus omnium Romanorum pontificum, *quæ venirent*, excogitavit. . . . Hic primus vendidit officia Procuratoris Cameræ, Notariatûs apostolici, Protonotariatûs Capitolii, Notariatûs Gymnasii, metiendi salis, et Cameriatûs Urbis.'

[246] Onuph. in *Vit.*: 'Alexander, aliorum pontificum exemplo, novum

He will see, further, that Sixtus IV. sat thirteen years, and created thirty-five cardinals; Innocent VIII. eight years, and created thirteen; Alexander VI. eleven years, and created either forty-three or forty-five. Then, pursuing the subject, he would find that Julius II. sat ten years, and created twenty-seven; while Leo X. sat but eight years, and created forty-five,[247] of whom thirty-one were created in one day—namely, on July 1, A.D. 1517.[248] There were thirty-three cardinals alive when Leo was elected, A.D. 1513; but on the election of Adrian VI., A.D. 1522, there were no less than forty-eight alive, the exact double of what that constitution of Martin V.—reaffirmed in the separate concordats that followed it—had prescribed in a General Council but 100 years previously. And what apology can be made, both for the number and nature of those indulgences which the 14th constitution of Martin V. had so solemnly declared it to be the duty of the Pope to restrict, 'lest they should become vile,' when Luther levelled his ninety-five theses against them in A.D. 1517?

§ 60. *Julius II. and Leo X.—Fifth Lateran Council.—Speeches of the Bishop of Modrusch and of Leo X.*

Still, Julius II. and Leo X. were very different, both as men and as popes, from their immediate predecessors. They

LXXX. Scriptorum Brevium collegium instituit, quorum loca singula DCCL. aureis veniere . . . Cardinales multos pretio creavit . . . et in his aliquot cardinales cæteris ditiores veneno tollendos constituit, ut eorum opibus in fiscum redactis potitus, profusissimè largiretur, inexplebilemque filii cupiditatem expleret.' I need say no more of Alexander than what his own successors have said of him (see below).

[247] Onuph. in *Vit. Leon. X.* 'Pecuniæ quærendæ causâ . . . pretio cardinales aliquot legit: et officia quædam venalia excogitavit, ut cubicularios, scutiferos milites, sancti Patri et Ripæ portionarios.'

[248] Ciaconius in *Vit.* gives an account of the murmurs excited in the Consistory of June 26 when Leo only proposed creating twenty-seven. It should be stated, however, that this act of his was in part by way of self-defence after the discovery of the plot of Cardinal Petrucci to poison him, and of the number of cardinals involved in it (Roscoe's *Leo X.* vol. iii. p. 124, 4to ed.). 'On that same day a storm overthrew the angel that stood on the top of the Castel di S. Angelo, struck an infant Jesus in a church, and knocked the keys out of the hands of a statue of S. Peter.'—Note to Hazlitt's *Tr.* of Michelet's *Life of Luther*, p. 20, from Ruchat. i. 26.

were distinguished by many qualities great and generous in themselves, but in the matter of reform far too indifferent to the emergencies of the times in which they lived. Julius II. had sworn at his election, in A.D. 1503, to convene a General Council. After waiting for it for eight years, a number of cardinals at length assembled at Pisa for a whole year, and only separated on the meeting of the 5th Lateran Council of A.D. 1512. Luther had quitted Rome in disgust two years previously; but it wanted five years still to that preaching of Tetzel which elicited his first public protest. Bearing this last fact uppermost in our mind, let us listen to what was actually said at that Lateran Council. First, to what Julius himself says in his Bull of Indiction:—

'Nothing for the last eleven years, in which we discharged the office of cardinal, would have been more to our heart than to see celebrated a General Council, and the Church of Rome reformed for the better. What, indeed, was it that made us so obnoxious to Alexander VI., the Roman pontiff of happy memory, our predecessor, than our wish and study of celebrating a General Council? What was it that made us a wanderer by land and sea, when the same Alexander our predecessor was enraged with us? What was it that compelled us so often to cross the Alps, to wander about Transalpine France, in the heats, amidst snow and frost, but because we were striving to get a council convened, assembled, and celebrated by the Roman pontiff?'[249]

Julius died during the fifth session, in A.D. 1513. In the course of the sixth session, Simon Begnius, bishop of Modrusch in Croatia, having passed in review all the trials which the Church had gone through since the return of the popes from Avignon, wound up his admirable speech as follows:—

'I have always deemed it a matter of the first necessity, that the head of our faith, the Roman Church, should, before all things, be settled, renewed, and reformed. For as that disease is the gravest which is spread down from the head, so that health is the best, which from a head perfectly sound,

[249] *Concil.* tom. ix. reg. ed. p. 1586 *et seq.*

as from a most pure fountain, is derived and communicated among the other members. We have now seen what passed in the age of our ancestors as well as our own; and almost all these results, or, at least, the greater number of them, have befallen us through our own instrumentality—our own faults. It is a weary as well as a painful matter to see piety, faith, and religion grown so lukewarm in our times, I had almost said so decayed, that scarcely any vestiges of them remain. And just when the Church is at rest from heretical persecutions, and is enjoying the greatest possible peace and freedom, the faith and fervour which we have inherited from our ancestors and engrafted in our own minds has grown so cold, that we may truly say with Jeremiah, "From the daughter of Sion all her beauty is departed,"—her innocence and chastity, that is. "Her princes have become as rams: enemies have entered into her sanctuaries." Is this that daughter of Sion, that bride of Christ, that ought to be one; but which our people have, like that lying woman who wanted the child cleft in twain, so often divided, rent, and torn asunder? Is this that daughter of Sion, and sister of Christ, which our ancestors handed down to us, defended with all their might, maintained inviolate with the shedding of their own blood, propagated by their fasts, and tears, and prayers? We, on the other hand, have lost the greater part of it already—I forbear to say by what means. And what shall I say of the small portion which remains to us, O fathers? I will lay my hand upon my mouth, and let each one judge himself. What I have said in my sorrow, and for the truth, do you hear and receive impartially, and consider, with your eyes open, as it is said, what will be for the common interest of us all?'[250]

Bold words these to have been uttered at Rome, in the Lateran, in full council, face to face with the Pope! Yet Leo heard many more like words said before it was over; and even what he said himself, in opening the eighth session, respecting the Bull of Reformation which he was about to issue, involved no small admissions:—

[250] *Concil.* tom. ix. reg. ed. p. 1686.

'Since therefore Julius II., our predecessor of happy memory, such was his zeal for the interest and protection of the faithful, for many other reasons, and because frequent complaints had been made of the officials of the Roman Court, thought good to convene a General Lateran Council, and appointed various congregations of our venerable brethren, cardinals of the Holy Roman Church (of which number we were then), and of other prelates, to inquire carefully into those complaints; and lest members of that Court, and others coming to it for graces, should be overburdened with charges, and likewise in order that the infamy under which its officials laboured should be speedily remedied, he published a Bull of Reformation, by which those officials should be further bound under heavy penalties to keep the statutes; yet, owing to his untimely death, he was unable to issue any special decree respecting those excesses, or terminate that Council. We, successors of his cares as well as his office, have never, from the first hour of our pontificate, ceased to make it our business, both to continue the Council, and to promote peace amongst Christian princes; still more, since it is in our mind to *effect a universal reformation*, to support by new measures, and carry out by means of increased deputations, all that had been provided by our predecessor from the first respecting offices. For there is no care that we have more at heart than to pluck up all thorns and briars from the Lord's vineyard, and take up by the roots and extirpate whatever militates against its perfect culture.'[251]

§ 61. *Bulla Reformationis Curiæ.—Mild Measures against Nepotism.—Two Remarkable Speeches.*

The Bull in question follows this speech at full length; but its title, 'Bulla Reformationis Curiæ,' shows it to have been only partial in intention, and but a small instalment of that 'universal reformation' which Leo, no less than Martin V., had spoken of as next his heart to effect. If we look into

[251] *Concil.* tom. ix. reg. ed. p. 1747, *et seq.*

details, it is mild enough and indulgent in tone. Nepotism having been the acknowledged bane of that court for centuries, was this the language to have been expected in dealing with it?[252]—

'Whereas, it is by *no means becoming to neglect kindred and relatives*, especially when deserving and badly off for means; but, on the contrary, it is just and praiseworthy to provide for them, *still we do not think it proper that they should be so replenished, either with a multitude of benefices or with ecclesiastical revenues*, that others should suffer loss from such intemperate bountifulness, or that scandal should be thereby caused.'[253]

Surely, there must have been a keen touch of irony in these words of Antonius Puccius, clerk of the Apostolic Camera, spoken later on the same day, during the ninth session (May 5, 1514), and reflecting both upon the well-known tastes of the Pontiff, and the lenient tenor of that Bull which had just been read!—

'How much responsibility and official solicitude therefore rests with your Holiness, that you may govern, elevate, and adorn that Spouse; though I imagine what I have already touched upon in my speech must make clear to you, nevertheless, each of those causes having been duly considered—as I proposed doing under my second head—by which you are bound with all your heart to study the government, the honour, and the wellbeing of that same Divine Spouse, it will be still more evident that, as much time as is spent by others in obtaining honours and emoluments, ease and luxuries—as

[252] Compare the stern language of the Council of Trent, Session xxv., Decree on Reformation, § 1: 'It wholly forbids them to strive to enrich their own kindred or domestics out of the revenues of the Church. . . . Yea, the Holy Synod, with the utmost earnestness, admonishes them completely to lay aside all this human and carnal affection towards brothers, nephews, and kindred: which is the seedplot of many evils in the Church.' (Waterworth, p. 254.)

[253] Under the head 'De Cardinalibus,' *Concil.* tom. ix. reg. ed. p. 1751. Further on, the provisions against 'blasphemy' both among clergy and laity ('quæ supra modum invaluit') are not a little remarkable, p. 1774. How much more summary is the treatment of 'incontinence' and 'simony,' p. 1755; of 'witchcraft' and 'heresy,' p. 1757!

much time as is spent by most people upon human studies and pleasures, or allowed for rest of body and mind—so much you should think it your duty to bestow on elaborating, enforcing, and perfecting a reformation of the whole Church and Christian commonwealth. Holy Father, let me state two principal reasons which occur to me: the one inviting you to prosecute this reformation of the Church, already commenced with all alacrity—the other threatening all Christians with Divine vengeance should you hold back.'[254] . . . .

The strongest language of all, however, had yet to come. It is to be found in the peroration of Stephen, Archbishop of Patras and Bishop of Torcello, who spoke thus, in the tenth session, uncontradicted:—

'Alas me! what do I hear? Woe, I say, is me, that I have been so long silent, and *thereby* become a man of polluted lips! Yet I have kept silence, O fathers, my lords, my superiors, because of those words of the Prophet: "Therefore the prudent shall keep silence in that time; for it is an evil time." . . . And because love has become extinct, there are no more loving admonitions, and the very name of concord is even now unknown. O times! when there is transgression from the highest to the lowest, and probity has given place to improbity, poverty to affluence, humility to pride, and love to avarice! What wonder, if from causes so different as is only natural, different effects are in time produced! The Holy Apostles, and those who built our Church with their own blood, had heavenly and unearthly aims—ours are perishable and transitory. . . . Now indeed is the day of vengeance at hand, unless by unequivocal ordinance of the Lateran Council, at your command, O Holy Father, in whom is the plenitude of power, penance for sins omitted or committed is preached amongst Christians, and a true reformation, both in spirituals and temporals, is all over the world made obligatory by your decree.'[255] . . .

Prophetic words indeed! But would they have come well from the lips of so high a dignitary, a full year from the pub-

[254] *Concil.* tom. ix. reg. ed. p. 1762. [255] May 4, A.D. 1515, ibid. p. 1790.

lication of that bull of the Pontiff, had it either effected, or had it been thought likely to have effected, any real change for the better?

The two remaining sessions were plainly those which had most interest for Leo, being taken up in receiving the submission of the Maronite patriarch, in publishing the agreement come to with the King of France for abolishing the Pragmatic Sanction, and in discussing a letter of Maximilian I. respecting measures to be taken against the Turks. Not a word more was breathed about reform. On the contrary, the Pope must have been sending off that other fatal bull into Germany, which set Tetzel in motion, just as he closed the council (March 16, A.D. 1517). Here, therefore, was a golden opportunity not merely lost but abused. It was not so easy to get together another council, as we shall see; but, had only what was afterwards done in the Council of Trent been done now, Christendom might never have been rent, or needed another.

§ 62. *Adrian VI.—His Instructions to Chieregato.*

Had honest Adrian VI. succeeded to the leadership of that Lateran Council, instead of Leo, it is more than probable that Tetzel would have never preached, or Luther protested: had those celebrated instructions which were addressed to Chieregato in A.D. 1522—two years after Luther had been set writhing under excommunication—then guided the deliberations of those assembled fathers, it is quite possible that Luther might have been peacefully engaged in carrying out the reforms of that council in his own fatherland, at the very time when even the equitable remonstrances of that excellent pope were thrown away upon him.

'Almost all those points,' Chieregato was instructed, 'on which Luther differs from others, are such as have been condemned by various councils long since; nor ought that which has been clearly assented to by general councils, and by the Church universal, as matter of faith, to be called in question

again, since it is treating the synod of the Church with injustice, to endeavour to throw doubt upon what has been duly ordained.' . . . Putting aside the one point of justification, which as yet had not been defined by the Church, it would be difficult, even in these days, to compress the argument against Luther as regards doctrine into terser or more telling form: and who can rise up from that noble message to the German potentates which follows, and not feel that now, if ever, they had a fair prospect afforded to them of that thorough reform of the whole Church, under lawful authority, which had been so long desired and so often hindered?

'You will also say,' continues the high-souled Pontiff, 'that we frankly admit that God permits this persecution to fall upon His Church for the sins of men, chiefly priests and prelates of the Church. For it is certain that the hand of the Lord is not shortened that He cannot save; but our sins separate between us and Him, and hide His face from us, that He should not hear. The Scriptures proclaim aloud that the sins of the people are derived from the sins of the priests; wherefore, as says Chrysostom, "Our Saviour, about to heal the diseased city of Jerusalem, went first into the Temple, that He might chastise the sins of the priests in the first place, like the good physician who performs a radical cure." We know that in this holy seat there have been many enormities now for some years: abuses in spiritual things, excesses in what has been ordained—all things, in short, perverted. The very things alluded to by that blessed pontiff (Chrysostom) are those which we have mourned over in Alexander VI.; nor is it surprising, if disease should have found its way from the head to the members—from supreme pontiffs to other prelates of inferior grade. All of us prelates, that is ecclesiastics, have turned aside every one to his own way; nor has there been now for a long while any that would do good—no, not one. Wherefore, it is necessary that we should all give glory to God, and humble our souls before Him, and see each one of us from whence he hath fallen. And let each one rather judge himself, than be judged by God with the rod of His fury. In all which, as far as

concerns us, we promise that we will use every effort that this Court, in the first place, from which perchance this whole mischief has proceeded, may be reformed; that, as from hence corruption has passed down to all that are subordinate, so from the same quarter health and reformation may go forth to all. To procure which results we deem ourselves so much the more straightly bound, by how much we see a reformation of this kind eagerly desired by the whole world. As we have often, we believe, told you previously, we never solicited this pontificate; indeed, as far as lay in us, we should have much preferred leading a quiet life, and serving God in holy retirement. And we should have certainly declined the office itself, had not the fear of God, and the genuine mode of our election, and the dread of schism, in case we refused it, compelled us to accept it. We therefore bend our neck to this high post, not for the lust of ruling, not for the purpose of enriching our near of kin, but, in obedience to the will of God, for the purpose of reforming His Spouse the Catholic Church, that has been defiled; of assisting the oppressed; of raising and honouring those learned and virtuous men who have for so long been neglected and ignored; of carrying out all other things which it becomes a good pontiff and lawful successor of blessed Peter to do. Still, let no one wonder if he should not see every defect or abuse removed by us at once: for the disease is too deep-seated—not simple, but manifold and complicate—whose cure can only be attempted step by step; and what is most serious and dangerous must be taken in hand first, lest, wishing to reform all things simultaneously, we throw all things into confusion. All sudden changes, says Aristotle, are fraught with peril to a republic, and he who rubs too hard draws blood.'[256] . . .

§ 63. *Clement VII.—His ill-starred Pontificate.*

Unfortunately, it was now too late for words, however rational, candid, or friendly, to arrest events. And it must

[256] Signed, 'Hadrianus Papa VI.,' ap. Raynald. *Contin. ad Baron.* A.D. 1522, § 70.

have been patent to those whom they were meant to conciliate, that Adrian was more powerless for action in his own capital than even in Germany. His death, which took place there the year following, was celebrated with rejoicings; his memory was avenged by the election of another De Medicis, of another æsthetic. 'Without doubt,'[257] says Ranke, 'the most ill-fated pontiff that ever sat on the papal throne was Clement VII.' By way of mending matters, he provoked Charles V. into seizing Rome, and Henry VIII. into breaking with Rome. Protestants acquired their distinctive name at the Diet of Spires, A.D. 1529; and promulgated their distinctive creed at the Diet of Augsburg, A.D. 1530. Few pontificates ever witnessed so many ill-starred occurrences in ten years, or did less to remedy them. When Paul III. assumed the tiara, in A.D. 1534, he found the door of the fold open, and half his flock stolen. He bent all his energies to close the door and retain the rest; but he had to spend ten years in achieving it. Thus twenty years might have been saved, had he, and not Clement, succeeded Adrian. He summoned a council to meet at Mantua, during the month of May A.D. 1537. It never met; but it was so near meeting, and the objects for which it was to have met had been so clearly traced out, that ecclesiastics were set thinking more seriously than ever of the times in which they lived. A year before it was to have met, we have Cardinal Sadolet, bishop of Carpentras, in the department of Vaucluse, writing to his friend and associate Cardinal Contarini,[258] a Venetian:

'Believe me, the vices and corrupt pursuits of these times do not reciprocate that wisdom and probity. We have, I trust, an admirably upright head; that is, a pontiff who both means and desires those things which are worthy of him. But his power is limited by the perversity of the times; for the whole body-politic is diseased, and the disease is one that for the present rejects medicine. It will take some time to be restored to some degree of health, just as it

[257] *Hist. of the Popes*, Forster's *Tr.* vol. i. p. 97.

[258] *Epist.* lib. ix. 10. It is dated March 13, A.D. 1636.

took some time to be brought to the diseased state in which it now is.'

With John archbishop of Upsal, he mourns sincerely over its adjournment:

'As to what you write of the danger that is likely to ensue to the Catholic faith from not holding the council, and of the increased insolence of our adversaries on that account, you certainly report nothing new. I always foresaw it would be so, and after it had actually come to pass that all hope of holding a council was at an end, I learnt, from numerous letters and communications, how the spirits of those who attack the Church of Rome had risen in consequence. Every day brings intelligence to me of some fresh wickedness against God, arising from the tenets of those men, and become perilous from the multitude of those who agree with them; nor do I, in short, see what hope there can be left to us of better things. Albeit, I had the means of knowing at the time that the sovereign pontiff was not suspending the council of his own accord, but in deference to the judgment of two crowned heads, who affirmed that the time was inopportune for transacting a matter of that consequence, which required a more peaceable state of things in the Christian republic, and freedom from war with the Turks and unbelievers.'[259]

To Hermann archbishop of Cologne, who turned Protestant about five years afterwards, he wrote (Nov. 29, 1841), complimenting him, by the way, for having revived diocesan synods in his province:

'Many were the impediments, in truth, that I saw brought forward when I was in Rome, discussing in our conclave this scheme of holding a general council of bishops, calculated to obstruct the zeal of the pontiff. Nevertheless, I then thought, and still think, this plan of assembling a lawful council to be the sole remedy against the daily ills and injuries which are wearing Christendom to death; or else, should this prove inefficacious, that no other human device could prevent its utter ruin. Assuredly, should a regularly-

[259] *Epist.* lib. xi. 18, without date.

convened council be of no avail, there is no other cure that we can look for; but we must needs all of us suppose that God, angry with us for our sins, and determined to punish us for them, on attaining their full complement, had decreed our destruction.'[260]

Cardinal Contarini[261] is a thousand times more explicit, whether in speaking of the Pope, or to the Pope. To Cardinal Pole he wrote from Rome (A.D. 1537, May 12):

'The pontiff has taken in hand the work of reformation—commencing with himself. He has chosen four cardinals—Simoneta, Ginnuchius, Theatinus, and myself—and has enjoined us to examine carefully and correct all that passes through the Dateria. We will not fail in our office as Christian prelates. Almost all the most reverend cardinals are favourable to a reformation. The face of the Consistory is beginning to alter. Things that are proposed are beginning to be not so readily granted. Canons are brought forward. It is made matter of consideration what ought to be done, and what ought not: so much so, that I—since I have never despaired—I won't say have conceived, but cherish great hopes that our affairs are daily taking a turn for the better. Above all things, I desire that you and the most reverend of Carpi should be with us, that by the joint efforts of many, the Christian republic may be restored with more ease.'[262]

To Paul III. he addressed two letters, of which the full import will be brought out presently, no less remarkable for their subject than for the uncompromising yet respectful tone in which it is handled. In the first of these, he says he is taking the liberty of offering some suggestions on 'that matter of reformation in which His Holiness had engaged;' while submitting them all to his examination and revision, and to the sounder judgment of others. In the second of them, after acknowledging the power of the Pope to the fullest extent, even in its abuse, he proceeds:—

[260] *Epist.* lib. xiv. 14.

[261] His character is admirably drawn by Ranke, b. ii. c. 1 (Mrs. Austin's *Tr.*), where other important extracts from his writings occur.

[262] *Inter Poli Epist.* vol. ii. p. 32, ed. Brixiæ, A.D. 1745.

'Certain jurisconsults have laid down that it is lawful for the Pope to do what he will, inasmuch as he is bound by no rule but that of his own will. Such they conceive to be the plenitude of the papal power. Now, this position is so thoroughly false, repugnant to common sense, contrary to Christian doctrine, demoralising to the good government of the whole Christian world, that scarcely anything could be devised more deadly . . . Moreover, what could possibly be excogitated in greater opposition to the law of Christ, which is the law of liberty, than that Christians should be subjected to and have to obey the Pope, let him be supposed to have from Christ the power of making and unmaking laws, and of dispensing with them at option, without any other rule for guidance than that of his own freewill? Heaven defend Christian men, I say, from this wicked doctrine! Let not the Pope impose, cancel, or dispense from any laws arbitrarily; but let him follow the rule of natural reason, the rule of God's commandments, the rule of love, which refers all things to God; to the common good, as the divinest of all aims; and to the good of each one, in conformity with His appointment . . . This, I say, is its true nature, and not the law of the will, as those jurisconsults maintain whose opinion is simply based on their ignorance of the foundations of true Christian doctrine and philosophy. . . .

'Holy Father, for the doctrine, and for the experience of affairs in which you excel, and for the natural wisdom for which you are so conspicuous, do but reflect whether it be not this rash doctrine that has given the Lutherans a handle for composing those books of theirs entitled "The Babylonish Captivity." For, I take God to witness, is there any greater captivity or slavery that could be palmed upon Christendom than this which is implied in the doctrine of those jurisconsults of whom I speak? . . .

'Far be it from us therefore to excuse our avarice, our ambition, our other misdeeds, by coining a false doctrine to suit our appetites. The prophet forbids the making of any excuses for sins that interfere with our hearty confession of them. . . . And here we are willing not merely to excuse

our sins by words, but actually to propound a doctrine, under cover of which we may call evil good, and good evil—in the very teeth of the Prophet Isaiah, or rather of the Lord who spake by him.'[263] . . .

This was going to the root of the evil with a vengeance; yet Contarini remained in undiminished favour with his chief. I much question whether Tribonian ever ventured to be as explicit with Justinian; or Cecil, Clarendon, or Sunderland with the Houses of Tudor or Stuart, acting on the received principle that kings reigned by divine right, and could do no wrong. Can any correspondence like this be produced between Colbert and the Grand Monarque? Whatever may be the faults of the clergy, as a body of men, in all ages, I know of no other profession in which manly avowals like these have been as common, or in which good men have struggled harder against difficulties, not always of their own making, for the sake of improving society, or with less heed of their own vested interests.

§ 64. '*Consilium Delectorum Cardinalium*,' *Authorship ascribed to Pole.*

I pass to a more remarkable instance of plain-speaking than even the preceding, though both are closely connected.

On the 22nd of December 1536 Reginald Pole, having been summoned to Rome, was made cardinal, and pledged to the work of reform amongst others. It appears from his epistles that he visited Rome again towards the end of October 1538, and remained there for above two months. About that time came out the celebrated report, made to Paul III. by a select committee of nine of his own appointment, and bearing the signatures of Cardinals Contarini, Caraffa (afterwards Paul IV.), Sadolet, and Pole.[264] Two editions of it appear to have been printed simultaneously—one by Antonius Blada, printer to

[263] Cologne, A. D. 1538, ed. Melchior, Novesian.

[264] 'Consilium delectorum cardinalium et aliorum prælatorum de emendandâ ecclesiâ.' The other signatures are those of the Archbishops of Salerno and Brindisi, the Bishop of Verona, the Abbot of S. George, and the master of the Sacred Palace.

the Apostolic Camera; the other by Gotardus de Ponte, bearing the arms of Paul III. on its titlepage. It can scarcely have been published in either case without his authority; and another cardinal of great name—Cardinal Quirini [265]—thinks it may be considered as having been drawn up by Pole.[266] Could this be proved, it should have a double interest for us all, as showing that Englishmen then, as now, were foremost in denouncing abuses and advocating reforms, even to the unsparing extent of this report. It was probably printed as a state-paper, rather than for general circulation; but copies of it having found their way into Germany,[267] it was extensively reproduced there, with comments by John Sturmius. In this shape it became matter of fierce controversy between him and Cochlæus; till at length his edition of it, as well as its defence by Cochlæus, were placed upon the 'Index' by Paul IV. That it was ever placed on the 'Index' as a separate work is considered highly improbable by the eminent editor of Pole's Letters; while there can be little doubt, from the extracts cited from the work of Cochlæus by Raynaldus,[268] that its authenticity, in the shape in which we have it, was never questioned. Let nobody condemn Luther, on the one hand, who has not studied its appalling statements: let nobody who has studied them, on the other hand, forget that it was drawn up and published by men who held it to be their duty, notwithstanding, to remain faithful to the cause of the Church against Luther. I shall quote but one passage from it, and I do so to show that there were some fundamental principles, besides practice, to be amended in the deliberate opinion of

[265] See various dissertations by him in his edition of Cardinal Pole's *Epistles*, Brixiæ, A.D. 1745, 'Superiorum approbatione.' The first of these is entitled 'Animad. in Epist. Schelhorn' (vol. i. p. xliii. *et seq.*); the second and third, 'Diatrib. ad Epist. Reg. Poli' (vol. i. p. 366 *et seq.*, and vol. ii. p. clxxxv. *et seq.*).

[266] 'Utique post adeptum cardinalatum.'—Ibid.

[267] Cardinal Schomberg was the means of sending them, as the story goes, and with the privity of the Pope himself. Possibly Paul may have had the precedent of Adrian before his eyes, who made public his instructions to Chieregato. Vergerius continued a legate of Paul up to A.D. 1540; so that as yet he had not written on it. (See Wolfii, *Lect. Memorab. et Recondit.* tom. ii. p. 691.)

[268] *Annal.* A.D. 1539, No. 22.

these grave men, on which one of them had already ventured to write privately; but on which, speaking collectively, they did not hesitate to be still more outspoken. I look in vain for any decree passed by the Council of Trent in condemnation of the erroneous teaching to which they ascribe so much mischief. Can it be that they had no cause for what they said?

'Your Holiness, instructed by the Spirit of God—who, in the words of Augustine, communes noiselessly with the heart—well knows the origin of these evils to have been from hence; namely, that certain of your predecessors having itching ears, as the Apostle Paul says, heaped to themselves masters according to their own desires, not for the purpose of learning from them what they ought to do, but that through their zeal and subtlety might be discovered for them a ground for doing what they liked. Thus it came to pass—and all the more because flattery ever attends power as a shadow the body, and truth can seldom penetrate into the ears of princes—that a school of doctors arose forthwith, who taught that the Pope was sovereign lord of benefices; and that therefore, when the lord sold, as he had a right to do, what belonged to him, no charge of simony, necessarily, could lie against him. And so the will of the Pope, whatever it might be, would be made the rule by which his acts and deeds should be measured—and the end of it all would be that he would be free to do what he liked. From this source . . . Holy Father, it is, that so many grave evils and abuses have poured into the Church of God, till we see it wellnigh borne down by desperation; and infidels, hearing of them, mock at the religion of Christ, as we can aver to your Holiness of our own certain knowledge.'[269] . . .

[269] Cologne, A.D. 1538, ed. Melchior, Novesian; or, Brown's *Append. ad Fascic. Rev. Expet. et Fug.* (p. 23), the original edition of which was published in A.D. 1535, with some encouragement from authority, by Orthuinus Gratius, in which shape it too was placed on the 'Index.'

§ 65. *Bishops who turned Protestants.—Bishop Hosius and John Sturmius.*

After the publication of a report like this, who could have supposed that the meeting of a council would have been staved off for seven years more, as staved off it was? To a certain extent society had got so used to the evils of which it complained that every description or enumeration of them would be read far more phlegmatically then than now, when, happily, such horrors no longer exist. That its publication should have proved a signal for the reactionary party to be up and at its old work again, we may well imagine. Who were, in reality, most responsible for the delay—the Pope, the Emperor, Francis I., or his Protestant or Mohammedan allies—it might be hard to determine. Facts testify to its disastrous results. In our own days, had but one bishop of the Church of England quitted it for communion with Rome, how great would have been the sensation on both sides! About the middle of the sixteenth century, how many prelates of the highest rank and consequence turned Protestants? Hermann archbishop of Cologne, and Paul Vergerius bishop of Capo d'Istria, and papal legate, went over about this time, forfeiting their respective sees. England had already gone over, bishops and all, except Fisher. The metropolitan sees of Drontheim, Upsal, and Gnesen contributed their Cranmers, and the churches of Hungary, Silesia, and Transylvania, generally,[270] their Ridleys and Latimers, as well as Fishers. The dissolution of monasteries was in the process of execution in England; the secularisation of church endowments was making terrible progress elsewhere. On one side we have Hosius bishop of Ermland, afterwards one of the cardinal-presidents of the Council of Trent, confessing to his metropolitan and primate of Poland:

[270] See Alzog. *Hist. de l'E.* § 323–28; French *Tr.* vol. iii. pp. 95–126. More in Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes*, vol. ii. p. 5 *et seq.*, Mrs. Austin's *Tr.* 'A Venetian ambassador,' he says (p. 12), 'in the year 1588, reckons that only one-tenth of the inhabitants of Germany had remained faithful to the old religion.'

'We owe it to our own vices that we see schemes entertained respecting the abrogation of our rights, the repeal of our privileges and immunities, the overthrow of our fortunes, by those very persons whom we are in the habit of treating kindly, bound to us by the closest ties. For when they note how much we have declined from our religious duties; when they behold us thinking of no one thing so much as amassing wealth, spiritual only in name, thoroughly carnal and secular in practice; when they see our lives and manners to be such as cause the name of God to be blasphemed among unbelievers, they not only judge us worthy of contempt and hatred, but they begin to have doubts about faith, religion, and even God: nor can they easily be persuaded to believe that there is any punishment for the bad or happiness for the good.

'For they reason thus — Did any such things really exist as our priests preach about, they would be the first themselves to avoid evil and do good, for fear of punishment or hope of reward. Hence it is that we perceive all consciences to be in a flutter: some embracing one sect, some another; many quitting Christianity itself on account of our unholy ways, and passing over to Judaism. For all which nobody is to be blamed but ourselves, who have gone astray, and given scandal to that extent that it can be no wonder if God should have made us contemptible in the eyes of men.'[271]

On the opposite side we have John Sturmius, in reply to the remonstrances of his friend, Cardinal Sadolet, appealing to the very same facts for his excuse, which Bishop Hosius, far from denying, had mourned over as but only too true:

'It has not been so much of our own free choice that we have been alienated from you, as from your unjustifiable conduct. But why do I class myself with such? I was a mere boy when Luther began to write, and now, just because I have not since then seen any abuses corrected, but only cruelty practised, I have passed over to those men who, from pressure put upon them by your party, have at length seceded. What

[271] *Op.* tom. ii. p. 156, ed. Rescius, Col. A.D. 1584, Ep. x. ad Nicol. D. Archiep. Gnesen.

else, indeed, could they have done? At first, when they beheld doctrine, discipline, ceremonies all corrupted, they demanded a reformation of them at the hands of the existing hierarchy. Those who granted it have remained to them in all respects as brethren: those who resisted it have been superseded in their functions, rather than in their revenues, by the civil magistrate.'[272]

§ 66. *Opening of the Council of Trent.—Different Treatment of Luther and Arius.*

At length (Dec. 13, A.D. 1545) the long-expected Council was formally opened at Trent, but even then amidst difficulties, and with what different feelings on the part of the Pontiff! Contarini, the master-mind of the party of progress, had passed away. He had almost succeeded in reconciling Catholics and Protestants at the Diet of Ratisbonne, A.D. 1541; but, in his absence from Rome, other spirits had gained the ascendant, and his proceedings were disowned, if not censured. And now, that very Pope who had placed him first on that memorable commission in behalf of reform, and had listened both to his and to its strong language with equanimity, was wellnigh breaking with the Council of his own summoning, and with his own legates, because they had decided on discussing the subject of reformation concurrently with that of faith.[273] It was indeed but too palpable that some declaration of doctrine was imperatively needed. Never perhaps previously in all past history had the Church been known to hesitate so long. How differently, for instance, had Arius and Luther been dealt with! Their career had in either

[272] The date of Sadolet's letter is 'Carpentras, July 1539;' of the reply to it 'Strasburg, July 18,' of the same year. They are published together, with a third letter from Sturmius to 'certain cardinals and chosen prelates,' before alluded to.

[273] 'On being informed of the determination to unite faith and discipline, the Pontiff was highly indignant, reproved the legates, and insisted on their withdrawing their concurrence,' says a writer as partial as Mr. Waterworth (p. lxxx.), whose remarks on the compromise that was subsequently effected are by no means convincing.

case spread over about twenty-five years,[274] and Luther may have been as promptly condemned by the Pope, as Arius by his own bishop. But, then, Arius had not taught heresy as much as seven years before the true doctrine opposed to it was set forth by the Nicene Fathers; and for the remaining years of his life—nearly twelve in number—Arius must have heard the decisive word 'consubstantial' quoted against him wherever he went. He had the true doctrine set before him all that time; but for twenty-five long years Luther had been teaching his peculiar doctrine of Justification by Faith, unconfronted by any specific declaration of the Church at all on that head;[275] and he died at least six months before any had been promulgated or even arrived at. It had been put off so long that one of the cardinal-presidents of that council—no less a personage than our own Reginald Pole—now shrank from attending the session[276] in which it was defined, the reason, possibly, for which he was afterwards stripped of his legatine powers by Paul IV.; while another, of scarcely less interest for England, who had been one of the greatest ornaments of that council—Carranza, archbishop of Toledo—was doomed to 'finish his course' in the prisons of the Inquisition, on the charge of having taught doctrine which these Tridentine Decrees so tardily stamped as unsound.[277] Of

[274] Taking Arius to have commenced as a schismatic in A.D. 310, when he was condemned as such by Peter; and Luther in A.D. 1520, though, in reality, Luther's was a longer career.

[275] See the preface to the decree on Justification by the Council of Trent, session vi., January 13, A.D. 1547. The decree on Original Sin had gone forth, June 17, A.D. 1546, and Luther had died February 18 of that year.

[276] *i. e.* that of January 13, A.D. 1547. See the note to Ranke's *Hist. of the Popes*, Mrs. Austin's *Tr.*, vol. i. p. 209, ed. 1840, which Mr. Waterworth, whose history came out eight years afterwards, had better have noticed, than glossed over the occurrence, as he does at p. cxi. It was indeed singular that Pole and the Archbishop of Sienna, whose opinions were known to coincide, should have been both taken ill just at that precise moment. Was Carranza, too, taken ill afterwards?

[277] He had accompanied Philip II. into England on the marriage of the latter with Queen Mary; became confessor to the queen; and was made Archbishop of Toledo by Philip on the abdication of Charles V., whose deathbed he attended, and for whose dying profession of faith his own was called in question. After having been in prison for ten years he was discharged, but sentenced to remain five years suspended from

their dogmatic value I have previously spoken in the highest terms: the greater the pity that they came out so late. It was not really till A.D. 1564, when the Acts of the Council, from first to last, were confirmed by Pius IV., that they became law in the fullest sense.

§ 67. *Reforms of the Council of Trent.—No Authentic Copy of the Acts yet published.*

Meanwhile, it is to the reforms of that council, as distinct from its doctrinal enactments, that I wish to direct special attention. And here I must begin by deploring a fact, which it seems to me that honesty should forbid disguising. For some reason or other, though 300 years have elapsed, and though they have been in safe keeping all that time, we are still without the authentic acts of that council.[278] It is as impossible that this should be the effect of accident, as that it should not lead people very generally to the conclusion that all cannot be right. The History of the Council by Pallavicino may be a masterly reply to the work of Fra Paolo, which it is, but it does not supply still all that is needed. Extracts from documents ever so authentic must always be unsatisfactory when access to the documents themselves is denied. Ten years ago I was assured that they were being prepared for the press. Ten years or more previously to that

his episcopal functions. He died seventeen days after his release. (*Nouv. Biog. Gen. s. v.*) Moroni, who held office under Gregory XVI., says of him (Dizion, *s. v.*): 'Raccontasi, che nello entrare in prigione dicesse, "Io mi trovo sempre trà il mio più grande amico, ed il mio più grande nemico; il primo é la mia innocenza; il secondo, il mio arcivescovato di Toledo,"' and then adds ingenuously: 'Infatti le pingui rendite di quella sede furono il motivo per cui divenne il bersaglio di suoi nemici.' What a reflection do these words convey upon the Inquisition—too strong, in Spain for the king, in Italy for the pope!—Comp. Ranke, ibid. p. 379.

[278] Mr. Waterworth, as far as I can discover, does not throw out a hint of this fact. Possibly he may have done so in one of those notes that have been suppressed. (Pref. p. vii.) He nowhere notices Mr. Mendham's publication of Cardinal Paleotto's MS., though it had been out six years before his own work. No disparagement is intended here to the great work of Le Plat, *Monument. ad Hist. Conc. Trid. Illustr. Collectio*, which contains all that could be got at on that head.

date a valuable MS. had been obtained and given to the world in its entirety by a member of the Church of England, Mr. Joseph Mendham,[279] which revealed, for the first time, the proceedings of the last two years of the council, in their naked simplicity; being a compendious narrative of its acts by Paleotto, then present as 'Auditor of the Rota,' and afterwards made cardinal by Pius IV. for his services there. I shall have occasion to extract one most unique passage from it before I have done.

But first of those sessions between June 17 A.D. 1546 and April 28 A.D. 1552. For all practical purposes we may consider the decrees on Reformation that were passed during that interval as evidencing rather what was aspired to than what was done. Otherwise we should scarcely have Paul IV. saying, in full consistory, on his accession (A.D. 1556), that he was most 'anxious to proceed to a reformation, which so many pontiffs had already promised, but in which, as yet, *nothing* whatever had been done;'[280] or instructing his legates to the effect that 'manners had become so depraved and corrupt, generally, that it was scarcely possible to discover a man of Christian mien or type: while laws and observances had fallen into that desuetude which is a sure sign of the break-up of a republic.[281] ... Amidst all which are heard, from all parts of Christendom, reiterated cries for a reformation of the Church, which, unless granted speedily, must gradually undermine the Christian commonwealth; but which hitherto, through wars and other obstacles, had been only desired, and not achieved.'[282]

Very little, notwithstanding, beyond words or initiatory

[279] '*Acta Concil. Trid.* A.D. 1562 et 1563, usque in finem concilii,' edited with notes by Mr. J. Mendham, 8vo. London, 1842. Unfortunately, his notes are those of a violent partisan. He published likewise *Memoirs of the Council of Trent*, in the preface to which he gives some account of his various MSS. documents, including that of Paleotto. (P. xiii.)

[280] Raynald. *Annal.* A.D. 1556, No. 1.

[281] *Instruct. ad Cardinal. de Pisis*, in the Bodleian Library, Rawl. MSS. Ital. vol. xxi. fol. 120. He was sent, A.D. 1556, to the Emperor and King Philip.

[282] *Instruct. ad Cardinal. Caraffam*, ibid. fol. 141. Sent to King Philip, then at Brussels, the year following (Raynald. A.D. 1557, No. 23).

measures at most, was done by Paul IV., except in the matter of the Inquisition. He was occupied with undertakings against the Spaniards till within a year of his death; insensible, by some strange fatality, to the rare opportunity of enlisting England into the deliberations of the Council of Trent, as may be gathered from its suspension during the entire reign of Queen Mary. Could he even have died without mortally offending Elizabeth, it is quite possible that the conciliatory attitude of Pius IV. might have induced her to permit England to be represented there, as Wales was,[283] to some extent, against her will.

§ 68. *Excellent Measures of Pius IV.—Bulls for Reforming the 'Curia.'*

Pius IV., as he was more discreet and condescending, so he proved the more practical reformer of the two by far. Between December 27 A.D. 1561 and July 1 of the year following, he had issued as many as seven bulls[284] for reforming different branches of his Court, in all which its abuses are set forth unsparingly. When, therefore, the ambassadors of Ferdinand exhibited the draft of their reforms to the reassembled council, in June A.D. 1562, of which the first was couched in these astounding words — 'His Holiness is requested first of all to reform himself and his Court!' his legates could reply, with dignity and with perfect sincerity, that 'they wished His Majesty to be apprised that the Holy Father was so intent upon reforming his Court, and so seriously engaged in giving effect to his intentions, that His Majesty and all others would soon be of opinion,

[283] That is, by Thomas Godwell, Bishop of S. Asaph, who arrived thither A. D. 1561.

[284] Dec. 27, 1561, 'Pro Reform. Rotæ Romanæ;' May 4, 1562, 'Pro Reform. Offic. Pœnitent. Apost.;' May 27, 1562, 'Correct. Cancellar. Apost.;' May 27, 1562, 'Tribunal. Rev. Camer. Apost.;' June 4, 1562, 'Audit. Caus. Cur. Rev. Cam. Apost.; June 31, 1562, 'Tribunal. Ordinar.;' July 1, 1562, 'Referent. Signat. Justit.'—See Cocqueline's *Bull. Rom.* tom. iv. part ii. pp. 116–37.

that in ordering and carrying out that reformation, His Holiness would spare no one, not even his own person excepted.[285]

And as with the Pope, so with the Council. At its first real sitting for business—namely, the nineteenth session—one of the assistant-presidents, Seripando, came forward with a scheme of reformation, which was entrusted to a second, Simonetta, to be put into more definite shape, to be submitted afterwards for consideration. And it is observable, that while Seripando urged that the reformation should begin with the tribunals of Rome, in conformity with the declared assent of the Pope, the Council preferred dealing with reforms more especially affecting its own members, and leaving its head alone.[286] The decree on residence, which entailed some intricate discussions, may suffice as a sample, striking as it did at the root of pluralities. Some had denied in previous sittings that the cardinals themselves could need any reform. "'I,' said the Archbishop of Braga, primate of Portugal, 'am of opinion that their illustrious eminences would be all the better for some very illustrious reforms indeed; for it seems to me, that the reverence which I have for them would savour more of earth than heaven—would be more apparent than real, if I did not desire that their conduct and reputation should be as unassailable, as is their station exalted.'[287] And the Pope afterwards observed with a smile,[288] when France pressed for still stronger declarations against pluralities: 'Truly there could be no better advocate for this kind of reform than the Cardinal of Lorraine, who is at once archbishop of Rheims, bishop of Metz, abbot of Fécamp, and holder of benefices to the annual value of more than 100,000 crowns!' It should be observed, in fairness, that some of the greatest pluralists were not the highest born. If, some fifty years back, the future Leo X. 'was, in the space of some years, successively named canon of the cathedral of Florence, of Fiesole, and

[285] Raynald. A.D. 1562, No. 58 *et seq.* xxiv. p. 320.
[286] Waterworth, p. clxi.
[287] Rohrbacker, *Hist. de l'Ég.* vol. xxiv. p. 369.
[288] Ibid. p. 369.

of Arezzo; rector of Carmignano, of Giogoli, of San Casciano, of San Giovanni in Val d' Arno, of S. Pietro di Casale, of San Marcellino di Cacchiano; prior of Monte Varchi, precentor of S. Antonio at Florence, provost of Prato, abbot of Monte Cassino, of San Giovanni di Passignano, of Santa Maria di Morimondo, of S. Martin de Font-Douce, of S. Salvadore di Vajano, of S. Bartolomeo d' Anghiari, of S. Lorenzo di Coltibuono, of Santa Maria di Monte Piano, of S. Julien de Tours, of S. Giusto and S. Clemente at Volterra, of S. Stephano at Bologna, of S. Michaele at Arezzo, of Chiaravalle near Milan, of Pin in Poitou, of Chaise-Dieu near Clermont,'[289]—two hundred years back, William of Wykeham, who commenced life as a poor boy, had, in spite of the remonstrances of the papal consistory, been appointed to benefices by letters-patent, 'the mere enumeration of which occupied several pages,' and 'included seventeen prebendal stalls, three rectories, and the deanery of S. Martin-le-Grand,' before he had been so much as ordained priest.[290]

§ 69. *Questors of Alms abolished.—Traffic in Indulgences forbidden.—Tone of the Decrees on Reformation.*

Here therefore was one class of evils, the accumulation of centuries, sought to be removed, though it took till the twenty-third session[291] to settle how far. Another decree abolished, much more summarily, for ever the office of Questor of Alms, that had caused so much scandal.[292] By another, 'all evil gains for the obtaining of indulgences—whence a most prolific cause of abuses amongst Christian people has been derived'—were swept away.[293] By another, certain privileges and exemptions are restrained or cancelled.[294] By

[289] Church's *Essays*, p. 291, from Audin.

[290] *Life*, p. 13. Burns and Lambert, without date.

[291] Sess. xxiii. c. 1. It had been originally proposed in the nineteenth.

[292] Sess. xxi. c. 9—mainly through the resolute attitude of Pius IV. himself.—Waterworth, p. clxxxiii. Compare the mild language of Sess. v. c. 2, ad f.

[293] Sess. xxv., 'Decree concerning Indulgences.'

[294] Sess. xxiv. c. 11. The exemption from payment of tithes did not, however, form one of these; and for

another, the establishment of diocesan seminaries;[295] by another, the celebration of diocesan synods[296] is provided for. By another, the practice of duelling is prohibited under the severest penalties.[297] Elsewhere, various immoralities and crimes are condemned; elsewhere, salutary regulations are passed for the restoration of holy living and strict discipline. In themselves, these decrees on reformation are one and all of them excellent. It is not for what they contain so much as for what they do not contain, that any reasonable exception to them can be made. Compared with the acknowledged abuses[298] which they were designed to remedy, their tone

the practical effects at Venice of that one exemption, see Ranke, vol. ii. p. 340–1, Mrs. Austin's *Tr.*—though, as translated, the last sentence does not square with the note.

[295] Sess. xxiii. c. 18.

[296] Sess. xxiv. c. 2.

[297] Sess. xxv. c. 19 (p. 275, Waterworth).

[298] Let me illustrate this by a single instance. It is now pretty well ascertained that the marriage of the clergy in Germany was not conceded by Pius IV., owing to the remonstrances, mainly, of the King of Spain. The instructions given by Philip to his envoy, Don Pedro d'Avila, on that head are to be seen, vol. ix. p. 361 *et seq.* of Cardinal Granvelle's *Papers* (ed. Weiss. Paris, 1849, 4to.). While Pius therefore granted the administration of communion in both kinds (ibid. vol. vii. p. 473) in a special bull, he was deaf to all entreaties on that other head, for the reason above given (*Miscell.* Leibnit. Lipsiæ, 1719, p. 365); though Paul III. had, as far back as Aug. 31, A. D. 1548 (the date of his bull—to be seen at full length, with the instructions relating to it, and two others issued at the same time, Rawl. *MSS. Ital.* tom. viii. fol. 62, in the Bodleian Library), gone some lengths in that direction. Ferdinand I. reopened the question in February 1564 (see Raynald, A. D. 1564, Nos. 28–32); and on his decease, Maximilian II., indignant that it should have been withheld through Philip, re-enforced his demand by this appeal to facts: 'Quis enim non videt et deplorat, inter Catholicos etiam sacerdotes per Germaniam regnaque et dominia Cæsareæ majestatis, ac serenissimi Principis Caroli, Archiducis Austriæ, *nullum propè aut certè inter multos vix unum reperiri*, qui verè cœlibatum agat: sed omnes fere, neglectis et spretis saluberrimis sacrorum conciliorum et canonum veterum et novorum constitutionibus, quarum plane nullus amodò usus nec cura est, notorios esse concubinarios, vel tacitos etiam maritos; quinimo plerosque non unâ concubinâ contentari, sed plures simul alere; multos etiam propter solius cœlibatûs necessitatem ad alteram partem deficere; nonnullos etiam semel ductam repudiare, et toties quoties aliam subducere solere, cum maximo animarum suarum discrimine, et laicorum scandalo.' (*Granvelle Papers*, vol. ix. p. 426 *et seq.*) Now let us hear Cochlæus on the other side: 'Habent illi quidem gravem adversus nos objectionem, quòd tot

is much more deprecatory than threatening. Against the teachers of false doctrine the number of anathemas pronounced by the Council is upwards of 130; against evildoers and malpractices of all sorts it is under 12. Was it that false doctrine had produced those widespread corruptions; or that those widespread corruptions had produced false doctrine?

Or again, compare the smooth tenor of these decrees with that of some of the speeches delivered close upon the time of their enactment:—

'The eyes of the whole Church—of the whole world—are upon us, expecting the long and universally-desired remedy for these accumulated evils from this holy council'—said one.[299]

'Our best way of providing for the safety of the Christian commonwealth, and for the salvation of those who have fallen away from it, is earnestly to endeavour to put away all those things from the Church which the enemies of Christ have just cause to reproach us for, and which deservedly offend pious men'—said another.[300]

'When I consider the miserable condition of these times, and the calamitous state of our affairs, I seem to see the Lord, angered and indignant, pursuing His Spouse with drawn sword for the wickedness of her children, and threatening her with slavery and desolation. Our only remedy lies in humiliating ourselves before God'—said a third.[301]

'In the visitation which has just been made, the wickedness of all kinds that has been brought to light in the lives of the clergy, and the supineness and negligence of certain

presbyteri cum impudicis (proh dolor) mulieribus se coinquinant, et castitatem non servant. Attamen non debet propterea status cœlibatûs . . . damnari aut aboleri. . . . Nemo enim ad ejusmodi statum suscipiendum compellitur aut cogitur. . . . Jam scimus omnes non licere uxorato conjugium suum relinquere, et in alium statum se conferre; sic et ecclesiastico presbytero aut monacho non debet licere, statum continentiæ relinquere, et matrimonium inire. Sicut enim maritus vovet uxori, ita ecclesiasticus vovet Domino Deo.' (Ap. Raynald. A.D. 1540, No. 49.) Excellently and unanswerably, to my mind at least, as he argues, he cannot deny the facts.

[299] Fonseca, theologian of the Archbishop of Granada, March 27, 1562.

[300] Didacus de Payra, a Portuguese, April 12.

[301] Fontidonius, theologian of the Bishop of Salamanca, May 24.

prelates amongst them, is beyond what I could state'—says a fourth.[302]

'Such wealth, such luxury, such pride in the successors of the Apostles, the vicars of Christ, the mediators between God and man, I am greatly afraid the longsuffering and endurance of God cannot allow to pass any longer unpunished'—said a fifth.[303]

'What excuse do the adversaries of religion allege for their secession but that the clergy are wanting to their duties, and do not feed their flocks with the Word of God; while by squandering their revenues, and by alienating the masses from true religion by the spectacle of their unholy lives, they create scruples in the mind of every well-disposed and good man. By restoring purity to the Church we shall get rid of all these evils, as well as of the pretext which they supply'—said a sixth.[304]

A seventh argues, with the farseeing instincts of a true diplomatist:[305]

'Christians do not live and think now as they did fifty years ago. Most of us Catholics are affected with the same disease—if disease it can be called—that the Samaritans were long since, who, on the woman returning from the well and telling them that Christ had come—that she had seen, heard, and conversed with Him—would not believe till they had gone out and made enquiry themselves; and then believed, as they said, not because of the words of the woman, but because they themselves had known Him. Take my word for it, venerable Fathers, a vast number of Christians, forsaking all other kinds of knowledge, are devoting themselves to the study of the Holy Scriptures.' . . .

This was that same orator who, some six months afterwards, in the absence of his chief, but probably not without his complicity, three months or more before the closing of the council, burst forth into that impassioned philippic which caused so

[302] Paumgarten, orator from the Duke of Bavaria, June 27.

[303] Farnier, Canon of Amiens, Jan. 1, 1563.

[304] Belcarius, Bishop of Metz, Jan. 12.

[305] Ferrerius, orator from the King of France, Feb. 11. All these speeches are published separately.

much excitement and agitation among the assembled Fathers, and which, beyond doubt, does not exhibit any marks of diplomatic reserve:

'In pleading before you, we are but using those same words with which the Prophet Malachi and the other priests assembled at Jerusalem pleaded. Upwards of 140 years have elapsed since our Most Christian kings have demanded the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, and sent deputations for that purpose to the Councils of Constance, Basil, the Lateran, and first and second of Trent. What their demands were was expressed in writing by John Gerson, D.D. of Paris, in the Council of Constance; by the most reverend Danesius, in the first Council of Trent; by the eloquent orators, my colleagues, and his most illustrious Eminence of Lorraine in the second. Yet here we are, weeping and fasting still! Some may say that abundant satisfaction has been afforded us in the decrees of former sessions. Very possibly, if one thing may be paid for another against the will of the creditor, we may be said to have had justice done to us. I invoke, as witnesses, the spirits of those who have departed this life, the Cardinal of Mantua and Seripando, of their survivors Hosius and Simonetta, of the most illustrious ambassadors of the Emperor: in fine, that dogmatic definitions, doctrinal discussions, and the like, have never been our request, but a thorough-going reformation. . . . It is well-known to you, from our written report, what we have asked for.'[306]

§ 70. *Reforms of the Council of Trent continued.— Sentiments of Pius IV.*

Were there not some grounds for his thus complaining? How many of the reforms demanded by France and Germany

[306] This extract is made from pp. 606–7 of Cardinal Paleotto's *Acta*, ed. Mendham, where it appears that the Cardinal of Lorraine had discreetly left for Rome a few days before, viz. on Sept. 18, while this speech was delivered on Sept. 22, 1563. It is somewhat differently reported by Le Plat (vol. vi. p. 233), and by Raynaldus (A.D. 1563, No. 170), who gives an account of the scene produced by it, and of the reply made by Cardinal Morone to it. Mr. Waterworth has taken no notice of it at all that I can discover.

had been conceded? The Pope had done what he could for the reform of his own court; but had the writings of those jurisconsults who had overstated his prerogatives been condemned? And why had the Council shrunk from the task of decreeing reforms for his court, which had been proposed to it with his own concurrence? The number of cardinals had been limited by Martin V., in the Council of Constance, to twenty-four, when all Europe was in communion with the Pope. It had risen to three times that number, and by what means was well-known: yet how reduced now the number of nations to choose from, as compared with what it had been then! Did the Council so much as attempt to revive that constitution of Martin V.?

There are some grounds for thinking that the assembled Fathers themselves must have been of opinion that they had not done enough: there is no room for doubting that their zealous head thought so too.

On the 17th of April, 1562, the legates had despatched Pendasio to the pontiff, to inform him how matters were going;[307] and they had 'represented that the reforms made in the previous sessions were regarded as unequal to the requirements of the times and of the Church.' They had 'noticed that the reforms recommended under Paul III., by a congregation of cardinals, were much desired; and they further sent a list of ninety-five articles, recommended by various prelates to the consideration of the Council.' All these subsequently,[308] with the exception of eleven immediately affecting his own tribunals, and which he therefore reserved for further consideration, the Pope left to be decided by it.[309] In his opinion could that have been done? In October 1563, letters were brought to the Council from the Cardinal of Lorraine, who was then at Rome, in high favour and intimacy with the Pope, which reported His Holiness as saying, in the course of

[307] I quote from Mr. Waterworth, p. clxix. and viii.

[308] Ibid. p. clxxii.

[309] His answer reached the Council about the middle of May, A. D. 1562. A year and five months had elapsed from that date when the Pope expressed himself dissatisfied with what had been done.

their conversations on that subject, 'that he wanted a thorough reformation carried out in the head and members alike; for that these were times demanding a still more rigorous reformation *than had, as yet, been proposed to the Council.* In particular he desired that it should decree what was necessary respecting cardinals; which if it omitted to do, he would himself ordain some stringent measure, beginning with his own nephews, whom he entirely wished to see resident and serving their churches in person.'[310] These letters reached the Council, as I have said, Oct. 16, 1563. On Nov. 2, the Archbishop of Braga, who had just come from Rome, reported similar conversations that he had himself had with Pius; and on Nov. 5, the Cardinal of Lorraine arrived at Trent, to confirm all that he had said in his letters.[311] The twenty-fourth session was held six days afterwards, or Nov. 11: the twenty-fifth and last session, Dec. 3: terminating the next day, on which day the Council closed. Either, therefore, all that should have been done between Dec. 13 A.D. 1545 and April 28 A.D. 1552, and again between Jan. 18 A.D. 1562 and Dec. 4 A.D. 1563, must have been done during that short month, or not at all. Now, there were certainly seventy-four chapters on Reformation passed in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth sessions, against eighty-one in all the other twenty-three sessions put together, and their tone is also stricter and more uncompromising: in particular, there are some solemn words addressed to His Holiness on the creation of cardinals:[312] and to patriarchs, primates, and bishops, on the subject of their visitations.[313] Still, while they contrast most favourably, both in quantity and quality, with all that

[310] Paleot. p. 618, ed. Mendham: 'Cùm de Reformatione cum eo ageret Sanctissimus, dicitur ei valdè constanter affirmasse, se velle Reformationem omninò in capite et membris perfici, hæcque tempora ejusmodi esse, ut severiore etiam indigeant reformatione, *quàm quæ hactenùs in concilio proposita est.* De Cardinalibus placere sibi etiam, ut quæ necessaria sunt statuantur. Immò si nihil de hâc re concilium decreverit, tamen se rigidius aliquid etiam staturum; atque a nepotibus suis initium sumpturum, quos residere et in ecclesiis suis servire omninò volebat.'

[311] Ibid. p. 662.

[312] Sess. xxiv. d. ii. c. 1.

[313] Ibid. c. 3.

had been enacted in the sittings of the whole eight years previous, it can scarce be maintained that they embody all that the Pope had desired; the truth being, that on one of the subjects named by him, they expressly disclaimed legislating at all;[314] and on a second, namely that of the cardinalate,[315] they offered advice without making corrections. To be sure, weighty reasons for terminating the Council had arisen, which prevailed with the Cardinal of Lorraine and those who supported him, and of which probably they were the best judges. I do not in the least question their sincerity; nevertheless, in fairness to all, what is fact cannot be passed over. Almost all the Protestant creeds, including that of the Church of England, had been in existence for years before that of the Council of Trent was drawn up; almost all the seceding communities had been for years isolated from the Church, before remedies of any real kind for so much as one of the manifold abuses, which nobody denied to exist, had been authoritatively decreed. I can as little palliate the atrocities committed or the errors embraced by each one of those separated bodies in turn, as gloss over those abuses, or the dilatory nervous action of the authorities of the Church in correcting them.

§ 71. *Sequel of Events.—Catholic Corruptions and Protestant Doctrines.—Successes and Reverses on both Sides.*

From the course of events which followed, it would seem as though the Sovereign Judge of all men was alternately displeased with both sides, and almost in the same degree. Seldom has more suffering been entailed upon humanity than in the wars of the Huguenots in France, the thirty-years' war in Germany,[316] the campaigns of Alva and of Don John in the Netherlands, and the rebellions of A.D. 1642–60, and even of 1688, in Great Britain and Ireland;[317] and each one of

[314] Sess. xxv. c. 21.

[315] See sup., p. 161.

[316] See this, as described by Mr. Dyer (*Modern Europe*, vol. ii. p. 597), or Mr. Woodhead (*Life of Queen Christina*, vol. i. pp. 247–9), by way of specimen.

[317] See another specimen at the end of Lord Macaulay's xvii. c. on the 'State of Ireland after the War.' There

these had a religious bearing and character. One of the fundamental principles of the Reformation, Erastianism, or, in its most seductive form, the Divine Right of Kings, was expiated by the execution of two of the most virtuous of monarchs—Charles I. and Louis XVI.;[318] and may it not be said equally, that the Nemesis of all those corruptions, for which the Church had never really done penance, descended on the sainted heads of Pius VI. and VII.? Catholic corruptions and Protestant doctrines contributed equally to their joint issue; and the French Revolution purified all parts of Christendom with terrible evenhandedness.

In the interval, each side seems to have fared according to the activity and inherent life which it exhibited. Doctrines were put to the test, and judged of by their practical results. Crimes on neither side advanced the cause which they were intended to subserve. For any advantages which may have accrued to the Catholic cause elsewhere, during the latter part of the sixteenth century, the defeat of the Spanish Armada and the expulsion of the Stuarts from England abundantly compensated the Protestant. The fall of La Rochelle was redeemed by the battles of Leipsic and Lutzen. The Inquisitions in Spain and Italy were retaliated upon by the penal enactments of our own statute-book. Christians tortured each other like savages,[319] and died with the constancy of martyrs on both sides. The New World offered a common asylum to all when expelled from the old. If South

is a curious little MS. in the Rawlinson collection (Bodleian Library), headed 'Livre du Massacre d'Irlande,' and containing a letter, 'De Mr. . . . missionaire apostolique en Angleterre, à Mr. Fore, docteur de Sorbonne,' well worth perusal on this head.

[318] Both in England and France a special religious service was appointed, by way of atonement, on their respective anniversaries. It was a curious coincidence by which the corpse of Charles I. was consigned to the vault containing the remains of Henry VIII. (See *James II.'s Life*, vol. ii. app. iv.)

[319] 'Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, Knox, the founders of the Reformed Church in their respective countries, inflicted, as far as they had the power and opportunity, the same punishments which were denounced against their own disciples by the Church of Rome, on such as called in question any article in their creeds.'—Robertson's *Hist. of Charles V.* b. ii., quoted by Roscoe, and cited in the Append. to Mr. Hazlitt's translation of Michelet's *Life of Luther*, p. 464.

America remained in Catholic hands exclusively, North America became much more, in point of numbers and influence, Protestant. If conversions to Catholicism were numerous in the seventeenth century, secessions to Protestantism had been far more numerous in the preceding, and secessions to Deism were fully as numerous in the succeeding age. Even the decisions of the Council of Trent failed to put down controversy upon points of detail which it had left open—no less than the Confession of Augsburg. There were Molinists and Jansenists, Gallicans and Ultramontanes, amongst Catholics: to be set against Arminians and Contra-Remonstrants, Puritans and High-Churchmen, amongst Protestants. Finally, from the desolating wars to which the French Revolution gave rise, the two Powers that came out the most unharmed and aggrandised, and did most for the resettlement of Christendom and of society, were Christian—but, unhappily, not therefore Catholic—England and Russia.

Now, had a prompt and thorough reformation—such as so many popes had desired and some of the most enlightened cardinals had sketched out—been effected early in the sixteenth century, it is impossible to say how many of these evils might have been averted; especially had it then been laid down as a principle, that reformations, in the true sense of the word, were needed from age to age, and that not one of them was to be regarded as sufficing for all time, or as superseding the necessity of ulterior measures of a more stringent character against uncorrected abuses.

The Council of Trent certainly came better late than never; and it may be urged with considerable force, that the reforms there made purified so much of the Church as then remained entire, and prevented any further secessions. But there are limitations even to this assertion, in the long run. In the first place, the disciplinary decrees of that Council never met with that complete acceptance in France which alone could make them effective: in the second place, those decrees professedly left the Court of Rome untouched. Whether a General Council could have devised remedies that would have proved more effectual than the repeated bulls of the popes

themselves, is perhaps doubtful; but had it tried and failed, it would have done its best, and established that point beyond dispute. As it is, the council attempted nothing of the kind. The promised reform of the head, as well as the members—a solemn engagement, dating from the Councils of Pisa and Constance downwards—was never carried out. Was it by way of retribution for this omission that its disciplinary decrees, such as they were, could never bind France?

§ 72. *Gradual Relapse.—Praiseworthy Efforts of Innocent XI.—Lateran Council of* A. D. 1725.

Be that as it may, what were the clear facts which ensued? In spite of all the excellent popes that reigned between the Council of Trent and the French Revolution, it is undeniable that the Court of Rome had, before the end of the seventeenth century, and within a hundred years of that Council, become once more but too like what it had been of old. There is authority for that assertion which cannot be set aside. Innocent XI. desired a reformation even more ardently than Paul III., and sought to bring it about much in the same way. 'He only consented to become pope,' says Sir Paul Rycaut,[320] 'on condition that his electors would assent unto, and subscribe certain articles for, the reformation of the ecclesiastical government, which he then proposed to them, which, the cardinals approving, a great part of them subscribed that night, and swore to maintain them, as did the others, in like manner, the day following. . . . The Pope confirmed the seventeen articles which were signed in the conclave by all the cardinals, being such as for the most part tended to a reformation of manners, and to an amendment of those abuses

[320] *Continuation of the Lives of the Popes*, p. 380; 'collected,' he says, 'from several Latin, French, and Italian authors,' introd. p. 1. He had been consul at Smyrna; and was author of the *State of the Greek and Armenian Churches in* A. D. 1678. Compare 'Conclave per la morte di Clemente X. nel quale fu creato Papa il Signor Cardinale Benedetto Odeschalchi di Como—Innocentio XI.—con instruttioni sopra il modo di riformare gl' abusi della Corte Romana.'—Colonia, *Presso Gio. Nicolao.* MDCLXXVII.

which were crept into the Church. . . . And, in regard that, in times of preceding popes, many unworthy persons were arisen to episcopal dignities, the Pope appointed four cardinals and four other clergymen, to examine the lives and manners of such who aspired to the degree of bishop, ordering them to admit none thereto suspected, or the least blemished with an ill-fame, or taxed of ignorance as well as a debauched conversation. And, in order to a thorough reformation, the Pope drove out from Rome . . . . . all persons openly scandalous and dissolute in their manners.' [321]

There had been therefore some truth in the pasquins that had been circulated all over Europe about Donna Olympia;[322] and there had been, it is much to be feared, no little foundation for those scurrilous publications that kept emanating from Rome about that time, under the very nose of the Inquisition.[323]

[321] So Burnet, to his credit be it said: 'His life hath been certainly very innocent, and free from all those public scandals that make a noise in the world. *And there is at present a regularity at Rome that deserveth great commendation; for public vices are not to be seen there.*'—*Letter from Rome*, dated Dec. 8, A.D. 1685 (p. 248 of his *Letters from the Continent*).

[322] 'The greediness of the Barberini in amassing money was the most exorbitant that had ever been known before in Rome; but when this woman came, she swept with both hands, making the rapine and extortion which had been used before seem to be attempered with some qualifications of modesty and mercy. . . . Whilst Olympia thus governed at Rome, the Court of Rome became scandalous: nothing but libellous jests, to the disparagement of the Pope, were daily put into the hands of Pasquin at Rome.'—Rycaut, *Innocent X.* p. 298.

[323] I shall instance but three out of many, all strictly anonymous:—

1. *Il Nipotismo di Roma* (in two parts), A.D. MDCLXVII. 12mo. It was translated into English by W. A., Fellow of the Royal Society, London, 1673, as *The History of the Pope's Nephews from Sixtus IV. to Alexander VII.* 'The Author to the Reader' says: 'To tell thee that this book comes from Rome is in vain, because the very title of it discovers the place of its birth. I give thee warning to read it in private, and keep it to thyself; for if the news of thy reading came to the Inquisitor's ears, without doubt thou runnest the hazard of an excommunication; for they have sworn to endure no books in Italy but those that shall flatter the Court of Rome. . . . I promise thee another work more worthy thy curiosity . . . which is *Il Cardinalismo* . . . in reality the eldest, because first conceived by me.'

2. *Il Cardinalismo di Santa Chiesa* (in three parts), A.D. MDCLXVIII. 12mo. In preface to Part II. we read: 'Posso dire in buona conscienza, d' avere stampato più manuscripti concernenti lo stato di Roma, consegna-

It was the system that was corrupt: and its corruptions were too deep-seated for the best and holiest of men—sovereign pontiffs though they were, or were supposed to be, over and above—to stem. It defied alike the zeal of Innocent XI., the spotless character of Innocent XII., the pious aspirations of Benedict XIII., and the colossal erudition and indefatigable exertions of perhaps the wisest pope that ever sat—Benedict XIV. From the acts of the Lateran Council of A.D. 1725 alone, we may judge of the low level to which matters had fallen. Their principal aim was to enforce the observance of the decrees of the Council of Trent, not by Gallican France but by Ultramontane Italy. It would appear from their language that even the profession of the creed of Pius IV. had very generally ceased to be exacted from ecclesiastics of high and low degree, on their admission to benefices; and that, in many quarters, no diocesan seminaries had been established, or diocesan synods held, in conformity with what Trent had ordained. Altogether, it pleads for their observance rather than for any stronger measures—what antiquity called emphatically,

Θρηνεῖν ἐπῳδὰς ἐπὶ τομῶντι πήματι.
Soph. *Aj.* 583.

—the real fact[324] being that all the energy of a Hildebrand would have scarce sufficed now. Benedict XIII. had expressly

timi d' Autori Catolici et Protestanti, ma certo che mi sono scandalizato molto più dell' opere de' Catolici, che de' Protestanti; havendomi fatto licito da me stesso, contro la voluntà dell' autor Catolico, di levar alcune parole injuriose e lascive; perchè li Catolici quando scrivono contro Roma, scrivono satire; et i Protestanti historie. E però amerei meglio di stampar opere di Protestanti, che di Catolici.'

3. *Il Sindicato di Alesandro VII. con il suo Viaggio nell' altro Mondo,'* A.D. MDCLXVII. 12mo. In preface we read: 'Si questa opera te insegnasse a biasimare i riti della Chiesa Romana, vorrei che la gettassi nel fuoco prima di leggerla. Ma non va cosi, insegnandoti solo a biasimar quelli, che indegnamente guidano, o pure che hanno guidato la chiesa Romana.'

[324] See particularly the evidence of one 'who had practised for twenty-eight years of his life in the Court of the Rota,' and the letter of Cardinal Sacchetti to Alexander VII. in A.D. 1663, from which extracts are given by Ranke, vol. iii. pp. 121–3, Mrs. Austin's *Tr.* The whole chapter (b. viii. c. 10) is well worth reading, but it does not state all.

convened that Lateran Council as a precedent which he wished all primates and metropolitans to follow in their respective provinces. It elicited but one response in all Europe, and that one was, curiously enough—Avignon.[325]

§ 73. *Striking Letter of S. Alphonso Liguori.—Advice to the Successor of Clement XIV.*

'Do please send me a letter,' wrote Cardinal Castelli, just fifty years afterwards, to S. Alphonso Liguori, 'which may be read in conclave before we proceed to elect a successor to Clement XIV., on the abuses which there are to reform in all ranks of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.' And the venerable Bishop of S. Agatha of the Goths wrote back accordingly:

'All that it is permitted to me to say is, that it behoves us to pray, and pray fervently: for, in the confusion and laxity into which all ranks have fallen, it is not human wisdom or prudence that can suffice to reestablish all things in their proper and normal position. The Omnipotent arm of God is indispensable. Among pastors there is a very small number indeed animated with a real zeal for the salvation of souls. Religious establishments are all of them more or less relaxed: there is little or no observance of rules or of obedience to be found among them. The state of the secular clergy is something deplorable. On every ground there should be a general reform amongst ecclesiastics, in order that hereafter some check may be opposed to the immense corruption of manners that one sees amongst laymen.'

Then he proceeds to lay down four rules that he would like to see carried out above all things by the new pope:—

'1. That he would never raise any but really worthy men—and would intimate to all princes never to recommend to him as candidates any who were not such—to the cardinalate.

'2. That he would refuse benefices to all already provided with any, and accord none to those who had done no good work for the Church.

[325] See Concil. Rom. in S. *Basil, Lateran.* Celeb. A. D. 1725, ed. Augustæ Vind. A. D. 1726, 4to.

'3. That he would be very severe in the choice of bishops.

'4. That he would not grant any favours prejudicial to strict discipline—for instance: permission to any religious to go out of their convents to see the world, or to become secularised, or to mitigate their rule.'[326]

Here we see the future pope solemnly cautioned by a living saint, in A.D. 1774, against those very abuses which, according to Sir Paul Rycaut, Innocent XI. had, on his election in A.D. 1676, set his face to amend—of the continuance of which the elevation of such men as De Noailles and Dubois, De Rohan and De Bissy, to the rank of cardinal alone in France, affords mournful but irrefragable evidence—to which, notwithstanding, the personal character of the popes themselves during all that intervening century stands out in such marked contrast, that we cannot but ascribe them to a system never thoroughly purged—in particular, to the never thoroughly reformed Curia. What had produced Protestantism in the sixteenth century, was now combining with Protestantism—superficially regarded as its professed foe, but in principle its intellectual ally—to produce Deism!

§ 4. *State of the Church of France under Louis XV.*

Travelling back in history from Rome to France, was there ever a Church more hopelessly corrupt than that of France had become under Louis XV.?[327] I do not, indeed, say for a moment more corrupt than the State. Its glories expired with Mabillon and Malebranche, Huet and Bourdaloue, Bossuet and Fenelon—men insufficiently qualified by their

[326] This remarkable letter I can find nowhere but in the extracts given, tom. xi. pp. 273–5, *Hist. de l'Église de Bérault-Bercastel*, par M. le Baron Henrion—where it is said that a good deal of it has been suppressed from delicacy.

[327] For a sketch of its actual condition, see Mr. Dyer's *Modern Europe*, vol. ii. p. 396 *et seq.*; Alison's *Hist. of Europe*, c. ii. § 4—who says in a note: 'The total revenues of the Church' (in France) 'derived from tithes were 130,000,000 francs, *of which only* 42,000,000 *were in the hands of the parochial clergy:* the number of ecclesiastics was 80,000!' Its territorial possessions 'embraced nearly one half of the whole land of France.'

learning and piety to be made cardinals in those fastidious days. That dignity was reserved for a new race, of the stamp of De Noailles and Dubois, in whom were portrayed all the characteristics of the Gallican Church in its last stage of decay, in its expiring struggles for life; making convulsive efforts to compensate for its own heterodoxy by increased intolerance, for its manifold abuses by its still more disgraceful intrigues.

'I can assure you,' writes Mr. Aymon,[328] in A.D. 1712—a second Paul Vergerius to be sure, but a man of intelligence, and till A.D. 1707 in the employment of Cardinal de Noailles[329]—'when I was in Paris four years ago, on some most imporiant business of a religious character, about the time when several prelates of the Courts of France and of Rome were engaged in drawing up a project of reformation, afterwards presented to the papal congregation of the Propagation of the Faith at Rome, and to the directors of the Royal Seminary for Foreign Missions in Paris, I learnt for certain, during the conferences which I had with those gentlemen in the course of the three or four months that I was lodging with them, that there were numbers of prelates in France, especially under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Paris, who would willingly lend their hands to a reunion with Protestants, on the basis of the reformation of the Anglican Church; and that they would be well pleased to shake off the yoke of the Pope, and establish a patriarch in France to manage their churches at home, as do the bishops of your flourishing country. I could mention to you by name many bishops, abbés, curés, canons, theologians, doctors of

[328] Arch. W. *Epist.* 28, endorsed in Wake's own hand '1712, State of Religion in France.' The letter is dated, 'La Haye, 23 Août, 1712.' I take this earliest opportunity of expressing my deep obligations to the Dean and Canons of Christchurch, Oxford, who gave me access, in the most handsome manner, to this valuable collection of MSS. letters, to which I shall have occasion to refer largely hereafter, and from which I shall hereafter prove at length several facts that I can now only allude to cursorily.

[329] See *Biograph. Univ. s. v.* (vol. iii. p. 137), where a list of his works is given. He was holding a pension at the Missions Étrangères from the Cardinal in A.D. 1706.

the Sorbonne, lawyers, philosophers, and other persons of distinction and merit, who have made very explicit overtures to me on that head: and who are only waiting for a more favourable conjuncture than the present one is, to take in hand the great work of a Christian reformation,[330] such as has been achieved in your episcopal churches. But not to abuse the confidences which have been reposed in me, I will tell you by word of mouth, at our first interview, all the details which you request me to communicate to you for that purpose.'

Just while Mr. Aymon was holding these conferences in Paris, we find Fenelon addressing a secret memoir to Clement XI.,[331] with whom he was continually corresponding, in which three French cardinals, two archbishops, twelve bishops, all the Dominicans, all the Benedictines in France, the discalced Carmelites, the French branch of the Oratory, learned men among the Capuchins and elsewhere, are charged with secret or avowed Jansenism. 'There are some good bishops left, to be sure,' he adds; 'but the greater number, hesitating and uncertain, range themselves blindly on whichever side the king may take; and no wonder, for whom do they in effect know but the king, to whose favour they owe all the dignity, wealth, and authority that they have.'

So matters went on, getting worse and worse, till under the Regency they had grown incorrigible. 'On the very day of the death of Louis XIV.' says M. Picot,[332] 'Cardinal de Noailles reappeared at court, and had a long interview with the Duke of Orleans. That choice alone showed what course things would take.' The Bull 'Unigenitus' added to the

[330] Mr. Beauvoir's second letter from Paris to Archbishop Wake (ibid.), dated 18th Sept. 1717 (N.S.), speaks of the same party as still in existence.

[331] I cannot find this in any of the correspondences of Fenelon that have as yet been published; but in some short letters from him to Clement XI. I find occasional mention of memoirs as having been sent with them, though not published with them. I can only, therefore, get at its substance as given by M. Rohrbacher, *Hist. de l'É.*, vol. xxvi. pp. 462–3. It was sent A.D. 1705 according to him.

[332] See that most useful work, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Eccl. pendant le XVIII^e Siècle*, par M. Picot, Paris, 8vo. 1853, vol. i. p. 377.

ferment which it was designed to put down. Five years from its publication in France, the Gallican Church had all but separated from Rome, possibly to form a coalition against Rome with England.[333]

'It appears,' says M. Picot once more, 'that, besides a thousand intrigues, shameful methods of seduction were employed to swell the number of appellants, and that large sums of money were distributed to that end. Thus the Archbishop of Rheims, De Mailly, in a letter addressed to the cardinals, archbishops, and bishops, publicly declared that the nefarious traffic of appeals had become a constant practice, proving it by what had taken place in his own diocese.'[334]

§ 75. *Ecclesiastical Intrigues. How Dubois became Cardinal.*

But of all intrigues, that by which Cardinal Dubois obtained his hat caused most scandal, even in that corrupt age. He owed it in part to his elevation to the see of Cambray, on the death of Fenelon, which, notwithstanding his iniquitous life as a layman—and he was no priest even then—he had extorted from the Regent but a short time before; in part to the vast sums of public money which he was able to employ for that end; in part to the good offices of the Protestant king of England, George I., to whom he addressed a letter of thanks subsequently;[335] but, above all, to his having been the one to apprise Rome of the correspondence going on between the archbishop of that monarch and some divines of the Sorbonne, with the full knowledge and approbation of his own metropolitan.[336]

[333] See below, on the subject of Cardinal Dubois. On the threatened rupture, M. Picot's *Mémoires*, vol. ii. pp. 39-40; and for a similar crisis, thirty years before, see Ranke, vol. iii. p. 179, Mrs. Austin's *Tr.*

[334] Ibid. vol. ii. p. 19.

[335] Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, vol. xxvii. pp. 420-1, and M. Picot's *Mémoires*, vol. ii. p. 112 *et seq.* Must it be added, that Massillon assisted at his consecration as archbishop, June 9, 1720?

[336] Arch. W. *Epist.* 29: Mr. Beauvoir to Abp. Wake, Paris, April 13, 1719 (o.s.): 'Abbot Dubois having secured the letters, &c., says not one word about them; so that his design

For the state of the monastic orders in France, we need only refer to the disorders occasioning the appointment of a commission by Louis XV. (July 31, 1766),[337] for their amendment. 'Monks in general are greatly despised in France; and all the world, great and small, is only thinking how to get rid of them. This will not be in our days; but it will sooner or later come to pass. The monks themselves are persuaded of it,' had been the prophetic remarks of a doctor of the Sorbonne to Archbishop Wake in A.D. 1727.[338]

'Faut-il s'étonner,' says the great historian of France—I forbear translating his inimitable language—'si la plupart des hommes pensans, au lieu de s'occuper de ce qu'avait été cette religion, de ce qu'elle pouvait être, ne voyaient en elle que ce qu'elle était alors, un fléau dont ils auraient voulu être délivrés? C'était l'Église qui avait détruit le sentiment reli-

is to keep them from public view.' Mr. Mills, in the dedication of his *Essay on Generosity* to Abp. W., London, 1732, p. xxxiv. *et seq.*, details the whole story still further: 'All the letters were immediately sent to Rome, as so many trophies gained on the enemies of the Church. This great minister, Abbot du Bois, was at this time pursuing a cardinal's cap, which met with some stops at Rome. His discovery of what was endeavouring in France, and by whom, is supposed to contribute not a little to remove all the difficulties out of the way, and procure the dignity . . . which he was pursuing, and soon after obtained. However, this change of affairs contributed to the good reputation of your Grace, since your letters were admired even by Clement XI., then pope, who declared it was pity the author of such profound letters was not a member of their church.'

[337] Picot, ibid. tom. iv. pp. 213–19; or, more fully, *Hist. de l'É. de Berault-Bercastel*, par M. Henrion, 4me ed. tom. xi. p. 157 *et seq.*

[338] This is in the Bodleian Library, Rawl. *A.* 275, No. 72, dated 27 Août. 1727. I must here remark that, as in England under Henry VIII., so now the dissolution of monasteries commenced with the Pope. 'This year' (A.D. 1528), says Collier (*E. H.* vol. iv. p. 87, ed. Straker), 'the Pope, at the King's instance, granted a bull for dissolving as many monasteries as amounted to the yearly revenue of 8,000 ducats.' Two more bulls for further dissolutions follow: 'Still more important,' says Ranke (vol. iii. p. 128, Mrs. A.'s *Tr.*), 'was a bull of Oct. 15, 1652, wherein the Pope complains that there were so many small convents. . . . He suppressed them all at a single blow, for the tares must, he said, be separated from the wheat. Men already began to think, and in Rome itself first of all, of alleviating the financial difficulties even of foreign states by the confiscation not of convents only, but of entire monastic institutions.' It was a precedent only too readily followed. For the commission of Louis XV. see M. Picot's *Mémoires*, vol. ii. pp. 503–4.

gieux; c'était le gouvernement qui avait détruit le patriotisme. Dans les deux siècles précédens, l'espérance demeurait, parcequ'on avait entrepris du moins de réformer et l'Église et l'État. Désormais, au contraire, on était détrompé de tout; on méprisait tout; on riait des abus et des vices, pour ne se pas fatiguer par une indignation inutile. On n'attendait plus ni du clergé, ni du gouvernement, une meilleure morale, ou de meilleurs exemples; et le scandale des abus était souvent dépassé par le scandale de ceux mêmes qui les dénonçaient au public.'[339] . . .

How fearful are the calamities which ensue from perverseness or supineness on the part of those with whom, whether in Church or State, the duty rests of reforming systems, great or small, ecclesiastical or political! That purification so tardily commenced—so superficially carried out—in the sixteenth century, when it might have been accomplished by fair means, had to be consummated by a deluge of blood in the eighteenth century. And still, in spite of that dread judgment, there are those whose very watchword is, 'No more reform!' As if the vine did not require to be dressed and pruned extensively year after year to bear its full amount of fruit! Were we in the habit of dealing with ourselves as too many still hold that systems are to be dealt with, what sinks of iniquity should we not all of us be long before we had attained to threescore and ten years! The thought that each one of us must one day stand before the judgment-seat of Christ prevents any such delusion on the absolute necessity of reform in our own case. Would that there could be the same salutary apprehension of a judgment to come for every system likewise! To that salutary apprehension, amongst other motives, we owe it that there is a bright side—and a very bright one, thank God!—to the ecclesiastical picture on which we have been engaged, and to which it is a real relief to turn. On two points—and two points only that I can discover—has Luther proved a benefactor to mankind. The first is that he did not, like Mohammed, break with Christianity, or seek to

[339] *Hist.* vol. xxviii. p. 177.

interpose between redeemed man and his Redeemer. The second is, that he woke up subjectivities. That question, 'How am I justified?' roused to life and action thousands of spiritual agencies, with infinitely more of heaven in them than his own; and personal holiness, by its immense exuberance from that time forth, has gone far to make up for any past obliquities, any present shortcomings, of the collective body.

§ 76. *Excellent Character of the Popes since the Reformation.—Saintly Men and Women.*

Ever since the Reformation, what a succession of exemplary good men has there not been, without any exception, in the chief see of the Church! The Protestant historian, who has dived deeper into their secret history than perhaps any other historian into that of an equally long line of kings, bears irrefragable testimony to their general merit, while the characters of some of them, according to him, are beyond all praise. Even Burnet[340] is edified by the spectacle of a living pope limiting the daily expenses of his table to 'a crown,' and admits that there was another pope—Sixtus V.—whose frugality refused to exceed one third that sum. What a noble specimen of a thorough-going ruler was not that Sixtus V.! What a splendid compound of learning and ability, Christian holiness and discretion, was not Benedict XIV.! The five who have since the Reformation borne that name, and the sixth who bears it now, of which the abstract is 'Pietas,' have they not one and all proved themselves well worthy of it, and, as the Greeks would say, '*καρτ' ἐπώνυμοι*'? Measure the emperors of Germany, the kings of England, Spain, or France, from the Reformation downwards, for personal character with those representatives of the Papacy, and on which side lies the advantage?

Or, again, measure any Christians, of any age, with those great and good men and women who, from the sixteenth

[340] Letter from Rome, as above.

century downwards, have arisen in the Catholic Church to elevate and purify society, and minister to its needs. Reformers they were all of them in the truest sense, first of themselves, then of the age—to some extent, even of the system—in which they lived. How beautiful must have been the spectacle of a whole city regenerated, as Rome was, by the persuasive graces and winning words that all the world testified to in a simple priest, undistinguished by any other prestige from his fellows than that of his unaffected devotion for Christ and for Christ's flock—S. Philip Neri! How edifying must have been the spectacle of the great Baronius, at one time engaged upon his immortal annals—at another time seen discharging, equally with the lowliest, the daily round of menial offices in that infant Oratory! His friend and contemporary, Bellarmine, that prince of controversialists, led the life of a saint while battling for the integrity of his creed. In the midst of his fiercest polemics he would often say, 'One ounce of peace is worth a pound of victory.'[341] And 'what shall I more say'—in the words of the Apostle—'for the time would fail me' to tell of that ardent reformer of abuses—that pattern of a Christian archbishop—S. Charles Borromeo; of SS. Theresa, John of the Cross, and Peter of Alcantara, those regenerators of the cloister and of the inner life; of SS. Ignatius Loyola, Francis Xavier, and Francis Borgia, those grand firstfruits of a Christian institute destined to eclipse all others; of S. Francis of Sales, who, could he have been ubiquitous, would have certainly brought back to the Church all who had left it; of S. Vincent of Paul—that founder of the noble order of Lazarists for Foreign Missions, and of the even more sublime order of Sisters of Charity, for the assuagement of every kind of social evil at home? Who can survey unmoved those splendid monuments of erudition and indefatigable industry, which those reformed monasteries of S. Benedict in France, known as the Congregation of S. Maur, reared pile upon pile—with such men as Mabillon, Montfaucon, Ruinart, Martene, D'Achery, Calmet, for their archi-

[341] Rohrbacker, *E. H.* vol. xxiv. p. 560.

tects—labours as precious as ever in our own days? Or, who that is not eaten up by prejudices can now refuse to see in the results achieved by the Jesuits—whether at home in their schools,[342] or abroad in their missions;[343] at home and abroad in their victories gained for the Church; throughout every department of science and literature, in their numberless and undying publications—one of the most striking pages in the history of religious reactions that the world has ever seen? Friends of culture, both of the mind and body—friends of civilization, refinement, and humanity—their very successes in behalf of the Church secured for them a host of calumniators, not merely among their foes but their allies. Against some charges indeed they have been always proof. They are perhaps the sole religious order that has ever existed for 300 years without so much as a breath against their morality. As little can it be said that their zeal has ever made them cruel persecutors. They have never, as a body, advocated capital punishment for heterodox belief or schismatical conduct. They have never held or taught any theories adverse to the perfect freedom of the will, or in support of tyranny of any kind. The right of resistance they have always claimed for the governed. And certainly, while they have vindicated for the authorities of the Church the hold upon individual consciences which is due to them in the strongest terms, no theologians have ever attributed a wider range to the operations of Redeeming Grace, or enlarged upon invincible ignorance more, by way of excuse for those whom, from their point of view, they are compelled to regard as aliens from the pale of the visible Church. That they had their failings as individuals; that they may have pushed some of their speculations too far, even in their palmiest days, is only what the primitive fathers of the Church themselves were not free from; that they interfered now and then too much in politics was, in a great measure, due to the circumstances in which their life was cast, or duty called them to move. That system

[342] For these see Alzog, and the authorities quoted by him, *E. H.* § 347; Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes*, vol. ii. pp. 25–37, Mrs. Austin's *Tr.*

[343] Alzog, ibid. § 349; Ranke, ibid. pp. 503–16.

which they stepped into the lists to combat, or Protestantism, was essentially the religion of States as distinct from the Church: in opposing it, therefore, they were brought into direct collision and constant relations with all those political factions into which every state is divided. It would be simple presumption in me to aspire to come forward as the apologist of so many great, pious, and learned men; yet such are the benefits which I have derived personally from their writings, their sermons, their conversations—always, as far as my experience goes, tending to elevate man in the social scale, by impressing him with a keen sense of his true dignity and responsibilities, and never the contrary by any means,—that I should ill requite them if I seemed to shrink, in a work like this, from bearing explicit testimony—'valeat quantum'—to them as a body of men unsurpassed by any other for their devotion to the service of God, and to the highest interests of all souls alike, rich or poor. And therefore it is that I mourn sincerely over the causes which led to their suppression, by the fatal Bull of June 21 A.D. 1776, originating in part, possibly, with themselves[344]—in the acts of some of their own body—but much more in the general decay[345] which, as it was beyond their power to arrest elsewhere, so they could not quite keep out of their own establishments—out of their own thoughts and ways.[346] Some mixed themselves up with

[344] Possibly the cabal against their general, Goswin Nickel, in A.D. 1661, and the transfer of all his power to their pleasure-loving vicar Oliva, did them full as much harm as the appearance of the *Provincial Letters* five years before. See Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes*, vol. iii. p. 134 *et seq.*, Mrs. Austin's *Tr.*

[345] I quite believe in the excuse given at length in the sixth of the *Provincial Letters*, among others: 'Si nous souffrons quelque relâchement dans les autres, c'est plutôt par condescendance que par dessein. Nous y sommes forcés. Les hommes sont aujourd'hui tellement corrompus,' &c.

[346] See the very candid résumé given by Alzog, *E. H.* § 372, and the brilliant one by Lord Macaulay, *Hist.* c. vi. There are three conspicuous instances noticed by the late Père de Ravignan, in his noble defence of 'Clément XIII et Clément XIV,' and of his own order:—1. The condemnation by Clement XIII. of *L'Histoire du Peuple de Dieu*, by Père Berruyer, p. 54. 2. *Les malheureuses Affaires du Père Lavalette*, p. 101. 3. *La Déclaration signée en* 1761 *par le Père de la Croix, provincial, et par les Jésuites de Paris, au sujet des quatre articles de* 1682, *concernant les libertés de l'Église Gallicane.* He adds,

commercial schemes; some propounded views in theology and casuistry, which they would probably to a man condemn now. All the world was enchanted with their vagaries, because all the world was intent upon their ruin. The 'Provincial Letters,' which dealt them the first home-thrust—the ships of England, which completed their overthrow in France,[347] were retaliatory blows, not by any means wholly unmerited. But the Benedictines, who allowed themselves to be dragged into the plot against them; the Bourbons, who demanded their suppression; and the Supreme Head of the Church, by whom it was conceded,[348] all paid the penalty of that deed to the full in its consequences. Assailed on all sides, they fell magnanimously, proving themselves to have been one of the chiefest of the columns of that Church, which came down with a crash so soon afterwards, and destined, as such, to be one of the very first restorations thought of in reconstructing its fabric.[349]

For it had been due to them, and to their labours principally, that so large a portion of Germany, Poland, and Hungary was won back to the Church in the latter part of the sixteenth century, and that such a profusion of zeal and activity was likewise resuscitated in the Church itself. In Lainez and Salmeron they had contributed mainly to the

'Je le dis avec le sentiment le plus pénible; rien n'excuse à mes yeux cet acte de faiblesse. Je le déplore et le condamne.'—P. 135, vol. i.

[347] 'La Valette, procureur-général des Jésuites à la Martinique, que son génie commercial avait rendue florissante, s'était ou obligé de suspendre ses payements, après la perte de quelques navires chargés, pour son compte, de plusieurs millions de marchandises capturées par les Anglais. . . . Alors il s'éleva une clameur universelle.'—Alzog, ibid.

[348] See the account given by Ranke, ibid. vol. iii. pp. 197–217. Père de Ravignan, in his *Tableau de l'Époque*, by way of preface to the above-named work, pp. 11, 12, cites Schoell, *Cours d'Histoire des États Européens* (t. xliv. p. 71), as saying: 'Pour renverser la puissance ecclésiastique, il fallait l'isoler, en lui enlevant l'appui de cette phalange sacrée, qui s'était dévouée à la défense du trône pontifical, c'est à dire, les Jésuites. Telle fut la vraie cause de la haine qu'on voua à cette société. Les imprudences que commirent quelques-uns de ses membres fournirent des armes pour combattre l'ordre; et la guerre contre les Jésuites devint populaire.' D'Alembert, Voltaire, Frederic II., S. Alphonso Liguori, Schlosser, and others, are then cited to the same effect.—pp. 13–20.

[349] By Pius VII., in A.D. 1801 and 1814.

ruling of the critical subject of Justification by the Tridentine Fathers; in S. Francis Xavier and Ricci that missionary ardour was rekindled, which afterwards found coherence and expression in the establishment by Gregory XV. of the Propaganda, with its countless appliances for overcoming difficulties of all kinds, caused by diversities of tongues, and the like.[350] By Suarez and Petavius patristic and scholastic theology was recast with refined precision in modern moulds. By Bellarmine, Maimbourg, and Becan, modern errors were triumphantly proved untenable from facts, as well as upon abstract grounds. By the Bollandists a memorial was erected to the saints of the Old Church, destined to be scarcely less immortal than they were, and radiant with their virtues. Maldonatus and Cornelius à Lapide devoted their lives to the cause of Biblical interpretation. Possevin and Canisius, Tursellinus and Viger, advanced the cause of education, or of classical literature generally.[351] High above them all, as a benefactor to subjective religion, is enshrined the memory of their noble founder, S. Ignatius, in his 'Spiritual Exercises,' to this day

[350] 'This body,' says even the phlegmatic Mosheim, 'has for its object the support and the propagation of the Romish religion in all parts of the world. . . . Hence it sends out numerous missionaries to the most remote nations, publishes books of various kinds necessary for learning foreign, and some of them barbarous, languages; causes instructions in Christianity, and other works designed to enkindle piety or confute error, to be drawn up in the languages, and printed in the appropriate characters, of the several nations: maintains and educates a vast number of selected youth designed for missionaries; liberally educates and supports young men, who are annually sent to Rome from foreign countries in order to become instructors of their countrymen on their return home; takes up and provides for persons whose constancy in professing and defending the Romish religion has drawn on them banishment or other calamities, and plans and accomplishes various objects almost beyond belief in those not acquainted with their affairs. The institution has a very splendid and extensive palace devoted to its use, the delightful situation of which gives it exquisite charms.'—*Cent.* xvii. c. 1, § 1. 'It is needless,' says Ranke, 'to enlarge on its achievements. Who does not know what the Propaganda has done for philosophical learning?'—Ibid. vol. ii. p. 471. There is nothing like it elsewhere still, though it dates from June 22, A.D. 1622.

[351] Mr. Hallam shows in more than one passage how the Jesuits 'took the lead in polite letters.'—*Hist. of Lit.* part ii. c. 1, § 25; also c. 2, § 19–23; and part iv. c. 1, § 5.

regarded as the best textbook of anatomy for individual minds: tracing out for them the full measure of their responsibilities before God and man in unerring outline, and submitting them almost, by anticipation, to all the rigours of that final examination which is in store for us all beyond the grave. As it came out first, so it has kept its place ever since, in a long series of devotional works on personal holiness by S. Theresa, S. John of the Cross, S. Francis of Sales, Scupoli, Louis of Granada, Rodriguez, Baker, Fenelon, Columbiere, Nouet, Avrillon, and many more—second only to the 'Imitation of Christ' in point of time and general scope—of more intrinsic utility, as a mirror of conscience, for individuals.

§ 77. *Victories achieved by the Church in the Age following the Council of Trent.*

From the history of the Jesuits alone we get the real clue to the march of victory achieved by the Church for the century or more following the Council of Trent. Starting into existence from that council, it was indebted for the steadiness of its advance to new orders, such as the Theatines, the Jesuits, the Oratorians, the Lazarists; to new creations, as the colleges founded at Rome by Gregory XIII. for various nationalities, and still more to the Propaganda; to old orders reformed, such as the Capuchins, Carmelites, and Benedictines: but, in reality, personal holiness and individual energy was at the bottom of them all. By striking out new lines of thought and action, it propped up the system; as long as it remained in full vigour all went on well; as soon as it decayed, even the best and most successful of the new orders tottered, and was at length overborne. Protestantism was victorious enough as long as it had but the old system to attack; but as soon as ever subjective holiness came in force to the rescue, it was beat back into corners, with all its nakedness exposed to view. What men had it to compare for a moment with the saints of the Church, as followers of Christ, as patterns of that angelic life upon earth of which Christians are capable? Luther was actuated by no prospect of emolument or advancement in what he did: he led a temperate and moral life, but he pro-

fessed no strictness at all. Because he wished to see monastic vows abolished, was he absolved from his own? Melanchthon was pure and amiable, but he was infinitely more admired than followed.[352] Calvin attempted to bind his disciples to a system of austere discipline, but it was more than once rebelled against during his lifetime, and may be said to have died out with him. Zuinglius, who preceded,[353] and Beza, who succeeded him,[354] had been notorious profligates. Osiander was another whose character did not stand high even among his friends.[355] Cranmer, his nephew by unlawful means, accepted the archiepiscopal pall with a lie in his mouth.[356] Laurent Petersen, archbishop of Upsal, bemoaned the licentiousness of his own party, which he could not check.[357] Neither Bullinger nor Bucer, Œcolampadius nor Peter Martyr, led lives of more than average respectability. I am not now speaking of them as writers, but as teachers and preachers of the Gospel, which they assumed to be; yet it is notorious that men did not become better Christians, or even more moral, than they had been previously, nor creeds more simple and intelligible than heretofore, under their auspices. There was no burning enthusiasm on their part to carry the Gospel to the heathen, where Christ had never been preached at all. The greater part of their time was spent in the investigation of negations or contradictions, and their whole force was paralysed by seeking to impose new professions of faith upon each other. Isolated, or divided amongst themselves, their learning, great as it was, offered no effectual resistance to the compact mass of learning, zeal, and piety combined by which it was assailed. Practice, as usual, was the criterion by which the multitude judged: and hence no wonder that it should have come to pass, as Lord Macaulay, with the pages of Ranke open before him, has observed pointedly,[358] that, though

[352] See Bossuet, *Hist. des Variations*, liv. v. § 43, with the quotations from Erasmus.

[353] By his own confession. See Alzog, *E. H.* § 313.

[354] Ibid. § 321.

[355] *Hist. des Var.* liv. viii. § 42–5.

[356] Ibid. liv. vii. § 9–11; Collier, *E. H.* vol. iv. p. 211, ed. Straker.

[357] Alzog, *E. H.* § 327.

[358] *Essay on Ranke*, pp. 122, 132, Tauchnitz ed.

'at first the chances seemed to be decidedly in favour of Protestantism, the victory remained with the Church of Rome. On every point she was successful. If we overleap another half-century, we find her victorious and dominant in France, Belgium, Bavaria, Bohemia, Austria, Poland, and Hungary. Protestantism had at first driven back Catholicism to the Alps and the Pyrenees; Catholicism had rallied, and had driven back Protestantism even to the German Ocean. Nor has Protestantism, in the course of 200 years, been able to reconquer any portion of what was then lost.'

He is here speaking of the Continent only. In England, what had been lost under Edward VI. was regained under Mary; what had been lost under Elizabeth was wellnigh regained under the Stuarts, when through some strange fatuity, or fatality, it was swept away more rudely than ever. Strictly speaking, there are two reactions in favour of Catholicism to be noticed, at home and abroad. That of the sixteenth century was one of nations; and this it is on which Lord Macaulay and Professor Ranke have bestowed so much space. That of the seventeenth century was one of individuals; which, though it has escaped them, has not escaped Mosheim, in whose pages a long list of proselytes, of the highest rank and acquirements, commencing with Queen Christina, may be seen, and for whose conduct, with his usual unfairness, he endeavours to find corrupt motives.[359] His list would have gained in importance had it been extended to England: for though neither Charles II. nor James II., nor even Dryden nor Sunderland, can be regarded as models, there were numbers of the stamp of Father Baker,[360] Sir John and Lady Warner,[361] Abraham Woodhead,[362] and Anderton 'the Golden-mouthed,'[363] whose works are still as much prized as their unsullied lives are revered.

[359] *Cent.* xvii. pp. 749–50, ed. Reid.
[360] Wood's *Ath. Oxon.* vol. iii. p. 7.
[361] *Life of Lady W.* London, A. D. 1691, 12mo.
[362] Wood, ibid. p. 1158.
[363] Wood, vol. ii. p. 514.

§ 78. *Protestantism and its Works.—Biblical and General Criticism.*

Still, in spite of its many serious reverses, Protestantism held on; and was in some measure indemnified for its losses elsewhere by its assured position in England, from whence it passed over to North America, where it has become dominant once more beyond dispute. As little can it be denied that it has conferred some benefits—considerable benefits on the whole, and in part due to its own fundamental principles—upon Christendom. Not by any means, indeed, that it has succeeded in making men better Christians than they had been of old: on the contrary, it has reconciled them to a dwarfed and hybrid profession of faith: to practice rarely rising above mediocrity; and so far it has defrauded a large portion of mankind of untold blessings, which, from never having experienced, they hold cheap, but which those who have returned to the communion of the Catholic Church, and have experienced, may claim to be allowed to estimate at their proper value.

What services it has rendered are much more negative than positive in their general aspect, and may be classed under three heads:

1. It has produced some good critics and Biblical interpreters. I do not find Roman Catholic writers half so scornful of their services as they were of the services of all their predecessors in that department. 'Luther,' says Dr. Alzog, 'expounded with great intelligence some parts of the Book of Genesis, of the Psalms, and of the Epistle to the Galatians: he has often translated and developed the words of the Holy Spirit, in language at once simple, popular, and attractive. Melanchthon, occupied betimes with the study of the Bible, applied his vast knowledge of Hebrew to the explanation of the literal sense of the Old Testament; and, true to that principle of S. Augustine, that the New Testament alone completely unfolds the meaning of the Old, he illustrated it by commentaries, dogmatic and allegorical. . . .

In the Reformed Church, Calvin, treading on the steps of Leo Juda, the German translator of the Bible, of Zuinglius, Œcolampadius, and Bucer, all of them subtle commentators on Holy Scripture, penetrated with profound religious sentiment into the Sacred Text, and developed its sublime meaning with marvellous ability, especially in his 'Commentaries on the Epistles of S. Paul,' where, however, he has frequently done violence to the text, in order to attribute to that Apostle his own rigid and austere system. . . . . Exegetical philology likewise owed its original development to Conrad Pelican; and afterwards it was still more indebted to the admirable labours of the two Buxtorfs, father and son, professors of Oriental languages at Basle, assisted by their knowledge of Talmudic and Rabbinical literature. Thomas Erpenius, and his famous pupil James Golius, did much to facilitate the study of Arabic; while Samuel Bochart explained both the geography and natural history of the Bible. . . . . Infinitely more free from prejudice than his predecessors, Hugo Grotius, the finest scholar of his age, commented upon the Old and New Testament with rare impartiality and immense philological erudition.'[364]

Another service rendered by them as critics was the detection of a vast number of spurious works and records hitherto regarded as genuine. The Magdeburg Centuriators, so far, inaugurated a new era in ecclesiastical history, notwithstanding their prejudices. Casaubon, Hottinger, Basnage, Mosheim, Spanheim, Neander, Gieseler, Milman, Ranke have been their successors, and, must it not be gladly acknowledged, with steadily increasing impartiality? As De Maistre said long since,[365] as De Ravignon re-echoed that saying but yesterday,[366] 'Les Papes n'ont besoin, que de la vérité.' Scaliger, Usser, Pearson, Voss, Grabe, Dodwell, Blondell, Daillé, Fabricius, Bingham, Beveridge, Routh, Palmer, Maskell, Neale are names inseparable from the study of ecclesiastical antiquities, and of the Fathers; nor

[364] *E. H.* § 338.
[365] *Du Pape*, liv. ii. c. 13.
[366] On the titlepage of *Clement XIII. and Clement XIV.*

can it be denied, with any justice, that, so far as they have contributed to separate facts from fiction, truth from error, in the annals of the past, they have been, to that extent at least, fellow-labourers with the Benedictines of S. Maur, and others of equal learning and industry amongst Catholics.

§ 79. *Rise of the Inductive Sciences.—Deductive Science worked out in the Middle Ages.*

2. As I have already noticed, there are two branches into which all sciences are divided—inductive and deductive. Now, Christianity had to make its conquest of both. It made its conquest of the last in the Middle Ages, when it appropriated and fixed its own sense upon the works of Aristotle and Plato, and consolidated its own dogmatic code. It has made or has been making its conquest of the first from the Reformation downwards, and principally, as might be expected, through Protestants. On the philosophical account of it all I shall dwell presently. Should it be objected that the study of inductive science has encouraged infidelity, it should be remembered how often scholastic philosophy advanced to the very edge of the precipice in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, even though it was working under the eye of the Church. How much more perilous the task, naturally, when men have worked as individuals, independent of any control but that of their subject-matter, or of their own sense of duty and responsibility? Nevertheless, it cannot for a moment be asserted that Lord Bacon, the founder of inductive science as applied to matter, or Locke the founder of inductive science as applied to mind, or Grotius the illustrious exponent of international law, or Newton the impersonation of natural philosophy, or Leibnitz the diviner of the science of language, and of how many others, or Adam Smith the philanthropic explorer of the science of political economy, were either infidels, or the friends of infidels. Quite the reverse! All of them were pious and well-meaning Christians, intent on the discovery of truth in their own sphere and for its own sake, and no less jealous of the

honour of revealed truth—some of them its ablest and best vindicators, in the spirit of that method according to which they worked. To say that they worked apart from authority, is simply to say that they were committed to those studies in which authority can be no guide at all—in which experiment and observation necessarily take the place of authority. And what is true of inductive science in general, is equally true of all its different ramifications—ethnology, archæology, chemistry, geology, the whole range of physics. But who can say that these are studies unbefitting a Christian man, even though the habit of mind engendered by them should tend to the elevation of private judgment, and habitual reliance upon self? Historically, beyond dispute, their advancement is one of the chief features of that era which is called the Reformation. Still, had the inauguration of that era been accompanied by no violence at all, they must have come up sooner or later with the discussion of the problem of personal sanctification. Providence brought about their development when their full time was come. We can as little conceive the schoolmen elaborating the inductive sciences, as the students of inductive philosophy elaborating that system of ethics and metaphysics which was taught in the schools. Neither, however, can in any justice be held to supersede or even disparage the other: it was necessary for the honour of the religion of Christ that both should be comprehended and unfolded by those whom He had regenerated by baptism, and educated by the light of His Gospel.

§ 80. *Collision between the Deductive and Inductive Methods.*

3. The critical time was when the inductive method was brought into collision with the deductive—criticism and free enquiry with authority. The truths of revelation, in themselves, are beyond our analysis. We have no test applicable to them which they do not themselves supply. We cannot say beforehand what revelation should be or what it should not be. The laws which regulate physical phenomena, the laws which

regulate our own minds, may suggest analogies in illustration or support of it; but we are not, therefore, entitled to reject it, should it ever run counter to them, or transcend them. Who can pretend to demonstrate even that all other planets, all other systems in the universe, are governed by the same laws which govern our own? The Lord of the Universe may surely make known to us some truths of which we have no means of judging from any criteria within our ken, but of which, as coming from Him, it would be madness to doubt.

The sole question that we can raise is in reference to the testimony on which they come to us. Let it be granted, however, that there is such testimony, and we cannot fail to perceive that the only logical position which it can assume is that of authority and unmoveableness. Whatever others may do, it cannot challenge its own credentials, or entertain doubts of their validity.

Similarly, neither are those who hold their principles upon authority the best qualified to submit them to the test of the inductive method, for the purpose of convincing others of their intrinsic truth. From the very nature of the process, they will be forced into appearing but poor believers, or but poor reasoners, if they attempt it. Stand on the defensive and repel attacks they may, no doubt; but their arguments will never be conclusive to any but those of their own side, whose convictions have never really been shaken in that authority which is called in question—who believe upon one set of grounds exactly what is denied upon another set. The man who can admit doubts is the only one really capable of analysing the ground of those doubts, and of restoring belief, where it has once been lost, in the position to which they relate, by proving those doubts to have been unfounded.

Thus, there may be times and seasons when rigid examination of its credentials by some, will be indispensable to their due acknowledgment by all. It was so in the first ages of the Church. Thousands believed them thoroughly; but some doubted, and others attacked them. Then uprose Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, Minucius Felix, Lactantius, Eusebius, and established the authenticity of those title-deeds,

and vindicated the obligations imposed by them. That work had now to be done over again, with some difference of details, once more. Criticism had discovered so many forgeries in the records of the past, that belief was shaken in what remained, and even the genuine were suspected. Induction, that had been applied with so much success to the phenomena of mind and matter, was only too eager to be employed in a new field, which till then had been regarded as so much church-land, or consecrated ground. Then another phalanx of resolute writers stepped forward, combated scepticism with its own weapons, and restored, one after another, the defences behind which Christianity lay enshrined. As Lord Herbert of Cherbury was foremost amongst its assailants, so the farseeing genius of Grotius was foremost amongst its defenders. But, as the controversy thickened, England supplied both assailants and defenders in such pre-eminent force, that as it has always been looked upon as the country which gave birth to Deism, so as little can it be denied that it was the country likewise in which Deism received its most complete refutation.

§ 81. *Refutation of Deism by the Church of England. Syllogistic Form of the Controversy.*

Now here is a fact, of immense interest and importance, comparatively unnoticed. The Church of England had not embraced the system either of Luther or of Calvin; yet, for all that, it was no longer in communion with the Western Church, or with the Pope; yet, for all that, it proved itself abundantly equal to the task of refuting heresy. For either Deism was no heresy at all, or else the Church of England refuted heresy as such: but, if so, on what grounds can its own orthodoxy be impeached? 'Satan,' it may be said, for it has been said authoritatively, 'cannot cast out Satan.' Had this been all, it might have been replied immediately, that Tertullian, with all his Montanism, was still able to refute Praxeas; and that Origen, though many of his opinions were condemned even during his lifetime, can never cease to be regarded as one of the greatest of Christian apologists. But this

is by no means all. The Church of England, from its peculiar position, was enabled to begin a work in the eighteenth century, that could not have been done so well by anyone else—that has not been done at all, before or since, except on principles akin to its own. The controversy then raging was one to which authority could have nothing to say. It was the inductive method that was employed throughout—reason literally matched against reason, on grounds common to both. First principles were put on their trial, so to speak. If authority ventured to do more than look on, it had to abandon its vantage-ground. The two processes are best contrasted in their syllogistic form. Authority said:—

'All that is taught by the Church is of Divine revelation.
This—doctrine or practice—is taught by the Church.
This—doctrine or practice—is of Divine revelation.'

Now, authority stood committed to the first of these propositions—in logical phrase, the major premise—on which it could not permit any doubts to be entertained without ceasing to be what it claimed to be; without abdicating what in ecclesiastical language is called its infallibility, or, in the language of politics, its sovereignty. The rest followed necessarily from that assumption.

But then it was precisely that assumption which was called in question; and the only way of restoring faith in it was by reestablishing each of its parts inductively, one by one.

'This—and this—and this—doctrine or practice are of Divine revelation:
This—and this—and this—doctrine or practice are all that the Church teaches:
All that the Church teaches is of Divine revelation.'

The first step was, therefore, to prove Christianity to have been a Divine revelation, and answer all the objections that could be raised against it, as such, upon historical or abstract grounds; the second step was to prove that it was Christianity, in its full and proper acceptation, and nothing else, which is taught by the Church.

Now, what I mean to say is, that no other Christian community was so well qualified to establish each of these pre-

mises, one after another, as the Church of England; and that, in point of fact, no other body has done so to the same extent. From the nature of the case, other Protestant bodies, however much they may have felt called upon to contend for the first, must have stopped short of the second; while Catholics themselves, whenever they attempted to do either, were compelled to adopt the inductive method. Was it to the dogmatic teaching of the Church that Chateaubriand's great work the 'Génie du Christianisme' appealed, to resuscitate faith in that system for which it had great difficulty in procuring a hearing at all upon any terms? Nowhere may we see the attitude of authority and the action of the Church of England more vividly contrasted than in the following epitome of some of the occurrences of A.D. 1725, by M. Picot:

'A.D. 1725, le 4 Décembre, Décret rendu à Rome contre l'Adéisidémon de Toland. On sentait de jour en jour une nécessité plus pressante de prémunir les fidèles contre l'impiété qui commençait à se montrer à découvert. Toland fut un des plus hardis.' . . .

Then follows a list of his works; and then the treatment which they had received from Anglicans:

'Presque tous ces ouvrages ont essayé des réfutations, dont peut-être ils n'étaient pas dignes: *mais qui attestent au moins le zèle et les talents du clergé Anglican.*'[367] . . .

Rome condemned them, as incompatible with the teaching of the Church, by a summary decree. Anglicans refuted the arguments contained in them one by one, proving Christianity to have been a Divine revelation in the strictest sense. Rome proceeded by the deductive, Anglicans by the inductive method in the same cause.

§ 82. *Unique Position of the Church of England.*

When I was a member of the Church of England, I endeavoured to the best of my ability to direct attention to this

[367] *Mémoires*, as before, vol. ii. p. 180 (Paris, 8vo. 1853). He notices the storm which they had excited in the Irish Parliament, and even in the Convocation of the province of Canterbury as well.

singular phenomenon; and it shall not be my fault if it fails to be thoroughly sifted now. With all my love for old friends —fresh and unalloyed as ever—I think it may be in my power to argue this whole question of the Church of England as dispassionately, at least, as most, being as persuaded as ever of the thoroughly Christian training which I received in it. Its destinies since the Reformation have been in many respects unique and strange. Its breach with the Holy See under Henry VIII. involved no difference of doctrine at all, and in appearance was not more grave than others which had been healed again and again in its own history. With that single exception, perhaps of no other country in Europe have the temporalities and ecclesiastical arrangements of the National Church, on the whole, been disturbed less. Any comparison between the revenues of the Church of England and those of the Churches of France, Spain, Portugal, and even Italy, is simply absurd. It is equally absurd where Protestantism is dominant, as in Sweden and Denmark; or where Protestantism and Catholicism exist side by side, as in Switzerland and Germany. The suppression of convents may have been complete in England, but where else has it not been so? Not only has the National Church in this country retained its ancient endowments in most cases, but they have been largely added to; now and then even what had been taken from it has been restored to it from conscientious motives, and in one case by the sovereign—I mean Queen Anne—as a free gift. The only portion of the Hierarchy that was abolished was confined to the minor orders, which even the Council of Trent could not deny to have ceased, 'in very many places,' to be realities.[368] And what a significant fact that is, placed side by side with the following—

1. That in all Germany, Sweden, Denmark, and elsewhere, where the hierarchy might have been preserved equally well, by means of those bishops and archbishops who embraced Protestantism, there was not the least effort made to retain it.[369]

[368] Sess. xxiii. c. 17, on Reform.

[369] Alzog, *Hist. de l'É.* § 336. Compare Dr. Dollinger's *Church and the Churches*, and *Christian Remembrancer*, vol. xiii. p. 425.

2. That subsequently some of those countries which had discarded Episcopacy, especially Prussia, made numerous applications to England to let bishops be consecrated for them in that country, but always failed.

3. That like overtures on the part of the United States of America proved, on the contrary, successful.

4. That Pius IV. in vain importuned the Council of Trent, while treating of legitimate bishops, to declare 'that the bishops assumed and created by or under Elizabeth were not lawful bishops.'[370] Strong opinions had been already expressed, in that very session, 'that it was certain that bishops did not depend on the Pope as regards order—that it was doubtful whether they depended on him as regards jurisdiction.'[371] And no decision was ever come to by the Council on that head.[372]

'From the age of fifteen,' says one of the deepest of living writers,[373] 'dogma has been the fundamental principle of my religion.' The deliberate conviction of a no less deep thinker and good Catholic in past time was different. 'Were it permitted to establish degrees of importance amongst things of Divine institution,' he says,[374] '*I should place the hierarchy before dogma*—to so great a degree is the former indispensable to the maintenance of the faith. *One may cite in favour of this theory a splendid experience which for three centuries has been conspicuous in the eyes of all Europe: I mean the Anglican Church, which has preserved a dignity and weight absolutely foreign to all other Reformed Churches, entirely because the English good sense has preserved the hierarchy.*'

It would be unbecoming in any Englishman—it would be doubly unbecoming in me—to shirk doing justice to that fact in the constitution of the Church of England which is the keynote to its whole history since the Reformation, so patent as to fill even a foreigner and avowed adversary with admiration. It alone, of all Christian communities in the

[370] Sess. xxiii. Waterworth, p. ccxvii.
[371] Ibid. p. ccxiv.
[372] Ibid. p. cclii.
[373] Dr. Newman, *Apol.* p. 120.
[374] De Maistre, *Lettre à une Dame Russe*, vol. ii. p. 285, *Lettres et Opus.* ined.

West separated from Rome, has exhibited any signs of growth or development on a large scale, or done work worthy of the name, whatever may be its peculiarities. The arguments for and against it naturally fall under two heads:—1. *A priori* grounds, in respect of its causes or constituents; 2. *A posteriori* grounds, in respect of its works or effects.

First, therefore, I assume that the Church of England claims to have what is called 'the Apostolical Succession'—a succession of bishops that can be traced back uninterruptedly to the Apostles themselves; in short, that this is her distinctive feature—the perpetuation of a regularly ordained hierarchy. For as, by immemorial law of the Church, one sacrament, namely baptism, may, in cases of necessity, be administered by lay hands; so, for the consecration of the Holy Eucharist in particular, it has never ceased to be considered indispensable to have regularly ordained priests. Therefore, let the integrity of her Apostolical Succession be conceded, and the validity of her administration of the sacraments, one and all, is established.

§ 83. *Lingard on Archbishop Parker's Consecration. Consecrators of the Old and New Rite.*

Now, on the *fact* of Archbishop Parker's consecration—and of all beyond him in the series, there has never been any question at all—I cannot imagine there being two opinions. It is as well authenticated as most, and better than a great many, facts accepted as such; and who amongst ourselves can pretend to have tested it more carefully than Dr. Lingard? I quote his results:

'Six theologians and canonists were consulted, who returned an opinion, that in a case of such urgent necessity, the Queen possessed the power of supplying every defect, through the plenitude of her ecclesiastical'—it is not said spiritual—'authority as head of the Church.' In conformity with this answer, a commission with a sanatory clause was issued, and four of the commissioners—Barlow the deprived Bishop of Bath, and Hodgkins once suffragan of Bedford (who had both

been consecrated according to the Catholic Pontifical), and Scory the deprived Bishop of Chichester, and Coverdale the deprived Bishop of Exeter (who had both been consecrated according to the Reformed ordinal)—proceeded to confirm the election of Parker, and then to consecrate him after the form adopted towards the close of the reign of Edward VI. A few days later, Parker, as archbishop, confirmed the election of two of those by whom his own election had been confirmed—of Barlow to the see of Chichester, and of Scory to that of Hereford; and then, assuming them for his assistants—for three bishops were requisite by law—confirmed and consecrated all the other prelates elect.'[375]

Was it the effect of accident that two of the consecrators should have belonged to the old, and two to the new rite; and that Parker should have afterwards selected one of the old and one of the new rite as his assistants? I venture to add these further considerations to what I have appended from Dr. Lingard in the note. Coverdale and Scory had, it is

[375] *Hist.* vol. vi. p. 17, 8vo. ed. 1849. Note C. in the Append. has as complete a review of the whole proceeding as could be wished. It shows, first, how the legality of Parker's consecration was subsequently affirmed by express Act of Parliament; secondly, how the Nag's Head fable originated, and its utter improbability; thirdly, it proves the fact of Parker's consecration, and the whole manner of it, from Parker's own Register, his private diary, and a Zurich letter, dated Jan. 6, 1560—from all which it appears that it took place on Dec. 17, 1559; then, fourthly, it points out the nonexistence of any record of Barlow's own consecration; yet shows that to be no valid objection; lastly, and fifthly, it points out the more formidable difficulty, whether the Lambeth rite was of itself sufficient to constitute a Christian bishop? What actually was done was, 'omitting part of it' (that is, of the ordinal then used), 'they consecrated the new archbishop in the following manner:—Placing their hands upon his head, they admonished him thus, "Remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by imposition of hands, for God hath not given us the spirit of fear but of power, and of love, and of soberness." How, it was asked, could this monition make a bishop? It bore no immediate connection with the episcopal character.' Here, if at all, is contained the real objection. But the *whole office* should be read through: it is a different form, certainly, from that now in use in the Church of England; yet even so, ought not the existing form to be held as evidence of the intention of the other?—Compare the existing *Book of Common Prayer* with the *Two Books* in Edward VI.'s reign (Oxford, 1841), pp. 417–22.

true, been consecrated according to the Reformed ordinal; but their consecrators were Cranmer and Hodgkins, who had been consecrated according to the Pontifical. Whatever the form used may have been in either case, it is to be presumed that those who were true bishops themselves intended to make those whom they consecrated exactly what they had themselves been made by consecration—or true bishops. And where has the Church prescribed any one form by default of which episcopal ordination is rendered invalid? Jurisdiction is another point on which, as we have seen, the Council of Trent itself shrunk from pronouncing even in their case. Had the bishops whom Elizabeth deprived[376] put forth any collective protest against the jurisdiction of their successors, declaring it to have been usurped and contrary to the canons, the position of the latter would have been much more questionable. As far as I can discover, only Bonner made any show of active resistance,[377] but it was not to his successor: and as the ejected prelates died off, there was no attempt made to fill up their vacancies.

One more circumstance remains to be noticed which, apparently, can never have crossed the mind of Dr. Lingard. Hugh Curwin, Archbishop of Dublin, had been appointed to his see by Queen Mary, having been consecrated according to the forms of the Pontifical in S. Paul's Church, London, on September 8, A.D. 1555. Now he it was who consecrated, in A.D. 1562, what may be called Elizabethan bishops for Ireland.[378] Can it be supposed for a moment that he would not have been summoned to consecrate Parker, had those six theologians and canonists who were consulted imagined themselves to be in any real difficulty for valid consecrators? From the time of Lanfranc, and of Patrick, second bishop of that see, and perhaps earlier, the prelates

[376] From our point of view they were legitimate bishops. Still it must not be forgotten that, from the Anglican point of view, 'the only canonically consecrated bishops of the province of Canterbury were those then surviving, who had been consecrated during the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.'—Perceval's *Apology*, App. p. 193; Palmer's *Orig. Liturg.* c. xii. § 5.

[377] Lingard, ibid.

[378] Sir James Ware's *Hist.* vol. i. p. 94, ed. Harris.

of Dublin had been in the habit of coming over to be consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and of making profession of canonical obedience to him as their primate.[379] As archbishops, indeed, they had long ceased to do this; still, it would never have been unnatural for them to have taken part in his consecration.

§ 84. *Church of England never doubtful of, or indifferent to, its Episcopal Succession.*

Thus, that Parker was consecrated, and that those who consecrated him were believed at the time to be canonically competent to do so, and that their intention must have been to confer episcopal ordination, is I think no more than we are bound to concede. And is there any one point in History, from that time forth, when the Church of England either doubted of the true character of her episcopate, or lost it, or was indifferent to its preservation as such? Plainly, no such case has ever occurred. On the contrary, it has never ceased to be her special boast from the first: she has continually been asked to impart it to others who had it not; and in one case it has been actually transmitted to another country speaking the same language—descendants, in short, of the mother-country—through one of her offshoots. Nor could there well be stronger collateral evidence of her own belief in the unimpeachableness of her claims from the first, than what is supplied in these speculations, from which I am about to quote, on the kind of reception which the celebrated Antonio de Dominis, archbishop of Spalato, would be likely to have accorded to him in this country. They must have been penned therefore before A.D. 1616, the date of his arrival, or between fifty and sixty years only from Parker's con-

[379] See Collier, *E. H.* vol. ii. p. 31 *et seq.*, or in time of S. Anselm, ibid. p. 81. It was Eugenius III. who erected four archbishoprics in Ireland, of which Dublin was one; but this, 'as the author of the *Norman Chronicle* reports, was altogether an innovation, and a diminution of the rights of the see of Canterbury—the Irish prelates being always consecrated by that archbishop.'—Ibid. p. 245, A.D. 1151. Yet what rights had the see of Canterbury that were not derived originally from Rome, its founder?

secration; and evidently by some Roman Catholic of high note on the other side of the Alps. They are written in Latin; but their heading is in Italian, and they form part of a collection of Italian MSS.:

'Should his Grace of Spalato expect to mix with them, he has reckoned without his host. The haughtiness of the Anglican clergy, as it is called, will decline his services as superfluous, or even injurious to its interests; for so convinced are its bishops, its ministers, and even the king himself, of the integrity of their church, that they imagine that it alone in the whole world is perfection, and wanting in no one respect . . . . But, you rejoin, here is, at all events, a bishop ordained in the Church of Rome, who can confer holy orders, and transmit legitimate succession to those sectaries. Most assuredly they will never attach any such importance to his Grace, or lay themselves under that amount of obligation to him. Why, what could be more damaging to those *who have always boasted that there never has been wanting a true succession of bishops in England?* For they say that, notwithstanding that Elizabeth oppressed the Catholics, there were still some Catholic bishops who took part with her, and raised others, whom she appointed, to that order. Thus bishops were provided by bishops; and there was a book published in English on that very subject about a year ago, in which the succession of their bishops is maintained. Who could therefore suspect England of wishing to begin a new list, and cancel the names and acts of all those bishops who have up to this time ministered to that sect? For this it must come to, should they admit succession to have been wanting to those who without it, as they argue themselves, could not have been lawful bishops. By that one act they would ruin their religion in the eyes of all intelligent persons; and oh! that such a blessing was likely to accrue to the Catholic Church, undesignedly through the wickedness of this his Grace of Spalato!'[380] . . . .

This is certainly very remarkable testimony, coming from

[380] Rawl. *MSS. Ital.* vol. xii. fol. 54 (in the Bodleian Library): 'Discorso sopra l'Archivescovo di Spalato circa la sua andata in Inghilterra.'

such a quarter as Italy, and of that date. Whatever others may have thought of it, in the mind of the Church of England there never can have been any doubt of the regular and unbroken character of its own Apostolical Succession, and of its intrinsic value, from the beginning. The grounds on which its orders have been denied in practice by the Roman Catholic hierarchy from the first—no less—have never been authoritatively declared. As for the mere practice of doing so, there might be set over against it the practice of the Greek Church, as distinguished however from that of Russia, which invariably reordains, and even rebaptizes, any—though they may have received all their orders immediately from the Pope—who come over to it from the West. And when the book of Father Courayer on Anglican Orders first appeared in Paris, if Abbé Girardin is to be credited, the Bishops of Blois and Troyes and others declared themselves in favour of their validity.[381] But it so happened that Cardinal de Noailles, then Archbishop of Paris, had just previously reordained some Anglican clergymen, who had presented themselves to him for that purpose; and as he did not like to stultify his own act, he, at length, used his influence to procure the condemnation of that remarkable work.[382]

However, it is not my business to dogmatise upon facts, but only to endeavour to state them as they are—impartially.

[381] Letter to Archbishop Wake, Feb. 19, 1724 (Arch. W. *Epist.* 30): 'Tout Paris ne retentit que de la dissertation sur la validité des ordinations Anglicanes. Les évêques de Blois et de Troyes se déclarent hautement pour cette validité. Le Père Tournemine, Jésuite, en a rendu un témoignage favorable en présence de M. le Cardinal de Rohan, disant que son témoignage devait paraître d'autant moins suspect, que cette dissertation semblait avoir quelque aigreur contre les Jésuites.' . . .

[382] Mr. Ayerst (chaplain to Sir R. Sutton, the English ambassador of that day) to Archbishop Wake, Nov. 1, 1721 (Arch. W. *Epist.* 29), reports that the Abbé 'tells him that he had informed your Grace in the enclosed of what has passed between him and the Chancellor, who has referred him to the Cardinal de Noailles; for fear his Eminence, who has been weak enough to consent to a reordination of some apostate clergymen, should take it ill that a book should be published wherein that practice is condemned.' One of these clergymen was a Scotchman, named Sharp. Courayer published a letter to Cardinal de Noailles, in consequence of the *Letter of Instruction* of that prelate, published in A.D. 1727.

And I trust to be found doing so, no less, in connection with that other part of the constitution of the Church of England —by what name shall I call it? its inmost soul—at which I have now arrived. For though, with Count de Maistre, I am inclined to place the hierarchy before dogma, still I would not for a moment be thought to undervalue dogma, without which no church, deserving the name, either has ever existed or can exist.

§ 85. *Of the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles.*

Very different indeed from any mere rupture with the Holy See was the publication of the Thirty-nine Articles and of the Book of Common Prayer; for, so far, one is inseparable from the other. In each of them a breach with the past, and to that extent that there is no other page of English history to compare with it. *Nolumus Angliæ leges mutari* has been our constitutional motto from time immemorial—a principle by no means incompatible with salutary reforms. The Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles imply the adoption of principles by the Church of England diametrically opposed to that maxim. How should we like, at one swoop, to cut off all intermediate legislation, and return to the primitive code of Edward the Confessor? Let Englishmen ask themselves dispassionately whether one principle which has worked so admirably in State should be abandoned for another, its exact opposite, in Church; whether, had we acted by our constitution in State as we acted by our constitution in Church three hundred years ago, we should have been the happy, flourishing, united nationality that we are now?

Of the contents of the Book of Common Prayer it would not be my desire to speak slightingly; but what in reality was meant when it was compiled and put forth? Was it the publication of a national liturgy for the first time? Was it the restoration of a national liturgy in place of a foreign one that had supplanted it—as in France the Gallican, in Spain the Mozarabic, as opposed to the Roman? Or was it the substitution

of one general office for the whole realm, instead of many —the very pretext, in appearance,[383] put forward by it? Nothing of the kind. It carried with it not merely the suppression but the condemnation, as unscriptural and corrupt, of all the old liturgies and service-books that had been the spiritual food of our forefathers for five hundred years or more,[384] as they then stood; and who can say for how much longer in substance? It threw them aside, one and all, indiscriminately with contempt, as made up of 'uncertain stories and legends, with multitude of responds, vain repetitions, commemorations, and synodals:'[385] drawing no distinction whatever between liturgies and breviaries, their variable and unchangeable parts, more ancient or more modern office-books. It classed them all in a lump under one category, as merely Salisbury, Hereford, Bangor, York, or Lincoln 'Use,' as though their whole difference lay in some 'diversity of saying or singing' them, and their chief intrinsic value was mere matter of plain chant.[386] Borrowing from them largely, but without acknowledging its obligations; suppressing some of the most material parts of their doctrine, while carping at 'the multitude of ceremonies' that it had 'put away'; altering their arrangement, where that arrangement was often of the last importance—it claimed to have restored order according to the mind of the ancient Fathers, and in particular to have redressed that grievance of which S. Augustine complained. A.D. 1536, a new edition of the 'Roman Breviary,' prepared with the approbation of Clement VII., by Cardinal Quignon, was published, having been authorised by a special Bull of Paul III. previously. It has been more than once suggested that 'the reform of English offices' went upon the same

[383] 'Concerning the Service of the Church,' in preface to *Common Prayer Book*.

[384] The 'Use of Sarum' was drawn up about A.D. 1085, by Osmund, then bishop of that see. See Maskell's *Anc. Lit.* pref. p. lviii.

[385] Ibid.

[386] See some very pertinent remarks by Mr. Maskell, *Ancient Lit. of the Ch. of Eng.*, pref. i–xiv., summed up thus: 'I think that it is quite clear that the first *Common Prayer Book* of King Edward, and all succeeding ones, were not in fact aimed at the abolition of varieties of music, but of a variety of prayers, and rites and ceremonies. This object was effected.'

plan;[387] and Mr. Palmer[388] has printed, in parallel columns, the preface to that Breviary, and the section 'Concerning the Service of the Church,' already cited from. But who can fail to be struck with the reverential tone of the first in contrast to the second? '*We* omit versicles, responds, and little chapters,' says the Cardinal, not because of their superfluousness or uselessness; for they are incentives to piety, and portions of Holy Scripture.' Again, the hope of the compiler of the revised Breviary is, that it will be judged 'not so much a new one as the old restored.' Again, who does not see the difference between retrenching a Breviary and retrenching a Missal; and between retrenching a Missal in those parts which vary with the day—its collects and commemorations—and those which are the same for all days—that are, and have been always, the same in substance for all Missals—the Ordinary and the Canon? Contrast *them* with the 'Order' for administration of the Sacraments of the Church of England. How comes it, if it be that real improvement on them which it claims to be, that it speaks so confusedly and equivocally—where they speak plain—that there never have ceased to be two sets, at least, of learned men in the Church of England, one asserting with confidence that some point of doctrine or discipline is authoritatively laid down in the Prayer Book, the other as confident that it is not? Is lay-baptism allowed in the Church of England? It depends on how the words 'lawful minister' in the rubric are construed. Is Confirmation, is Matrimony considered a sacrament by the Church of England? There are grounds in each case for two opposite conclusions. Is water to be mixed with wine in cele-

[387] A writer in the *Church Times* of Dec. 17, 1864, goes further. He says: 'It unquestionably furnished more than the mere plan of the Anglican revision. The Reformers had the book before them; and a very large portion of the preface to the *Common Prayer Book*, explaining the principles on which the revision was made, is actually Quignon's own preface. The words are not those of the Reformers but of Cardinal Q.' (He should have said '*some* words.') 'Indeed, *it is generally supposed that the rigid suppression of the Quignonian Breviary was owing not so much to any inherent defects in the Book itself, as to its relationship to the Anglican Common Prayer*,'—which, however, was *far more than a Breviary* from the first.

[388] *Orig. Liturg.* vol. i. pp. 230–4.

brating the Holy Eucharist? If the rubric does not say yes, it does not say no. Is there any genuine oblation recognised? The prayer of oblation is there, but not in its proper place. Is the Body and Blood of Christ really present on the altar on consecration of the elements; and if so, is Christ to be adored as present there and then? It does not appear whether the Officiating Minister is to kneel at all from the time of commencing the 'consecration-prayer,' though all to whom he delivers communion are bound to be on their knees at the time of receiving. Are the dead prayed for? 'How emphatical,' wrote Mr. Maskell, in A.D. 1846, 'is the expression, "all the whole Church,"'[389] in the misplaced prayer already mentioned! Who that has any prayerful sympathy for the departed at all could find adequate vent for it, either there or in the still more equivocal phrase, 'that with them we may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom,' at the end of the prayer for the Church *militant here in earth?*

'The members of the Church of England,'[390] ... wrote Mr. Maskell again, in 1846, 'well know that none but a priest can stand in their stead before the holy table and offer, in their behalf, the solemn prayers and praises of the office of the communion—that none but a priest can consecrate the elements. They believe also that the blessings attached to a worthy partaking are very great; but how much is there which they forget, or which never has been taught them!

'They have been told, and rightly told, that the natural Body and the natural Blood of Jesus Christ are not given them; but not with equal earnestness that the Body and the Blood are really given. They have been told, and rightly told, that the elements of bread and wine remain unchanged in substance; but not also that after consecration those elements are no longer common bread and common wine, but that they are endued with another and mysterious efficacy, tending to a better purpose than the mere supporting of men's earthly life. They have been told, and rightly told, that Jesus Christ

[389] *Orig. Liturg.* p. cxlviii. [390] Ibid. p. cxiv.

made but one oblation of Himself once offered; but not that there is also in the Eucharist another commemorative but most true oblation of His Body and His Blood. They have been told, and rightly told, that it is a dangerous deceit to say the priest does offer Christ in the Sacrifices' (for so he should have written, the words of the Article being *sacrificia*) 'of Masses; but not that all antiquity and all ancient rituals testify that in the Eucharist the Body and the Blood of Our Blessed Lord are offered as the efficacious and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. . . . *The direct prayers which were in the primitive forms had the sure and good effect of keeping up, in the minds both of the priest and people, a remembrance of the solemn truths which were expressed in them.*'[391] . . .

Take the canon of the Old Sarum Missal, for instance: and can there be any doubt what doctrine is taught in it, literally, unequivocally, throughout? As it was thought expedient that there should be but one 'use,' and that 'use' in the vernacular, why was not the Sarum Liturgy translated and authorised—Canon and Ordinary, just as they stood—with the variable portions of it in some respects revised, and all other 'uses' abolished? Similarly, among the various Breviaries of that date,[392] one surely might have been selected, translated, and adapted for general use, with any 'uncertain stories and legends' that it was found to contain expunged. That course would have been both intelligible and defensible.

§ 86. *Missal and Breviary of Pius V. Antiphons to the Blessed Virgin.*

That course was pursued consistently by Pius V. in his revised editions of the Roman Missal and Breviary, A.D. 1568–70, by the latter of which was supplanted the breviary of Cardinal Quignon, just as the service-book of Edward VI. had

[391] Mr. Maskell's own words witness, in some respects, to the effects of the English Office even upon a mind like his.

[392] According to Zaccaria, there were 'more than 150' to choose from in Europe at that date.—See Mr. Palmer's *Orig. Lit.* vol. i. p. 226.

been by that of Queen Elizabeth some ten years before.[393] Now it has been objected against the new Breviary, that it contains some innovations, particularly the 'Hail Mary,' with the addition of 'Holy Mary,' &c. at the end—which, it is asserted, 'was not found in any prayer before A.D. 1508'—and the antiphons to the Virgin in the office for Compline. The alterations in the Missal likewise, it is said, 'had the effect of introducing new superstitions.[394] Now, it is just the contrast between them and the English Prayer Book, in these respects, that exhibits the character of the latter in the plainest light. First, however, let me advert to one fact connected with their publication, manifestly to the advantage of the former, and vastly diminishing the force of the objection just made to them. In both cases the new Missal and Breviary were made obligatory in all dioceses where no missal or breviary was in existence two hundred years old. They might, indeed, be adopted in all dioceses with the consent of the bishop and of the entire chapter; but any missal or breviary that had been in use for two hundred years, duly authorised, in any diocese, might be retained in preference. Here was true conservative policy, and true reverence for antiquity combined. Not one of the Old English liturgies or breviaries would have been superseded by the constitution of Pius V. in A.D. 1570.[395] By the contemptuous spirit which animated the framers of the Book of Common Prayer, and by the far ruder ordinances which confirmed it, all were swept away—must it be said?—as so much trash, throughout the realm. Not the prescription of centuries, not the predilections of any number of Christian congregations in any diocese could have been pleaded in their favour.[396]

[393] For the difference between them, see Collier, *E. H.* vol. ix. p. 321 (*Records*, 77), ed. Straker.

[394] Palmer, ibid. p. 235, and note.

[395] Rohrbacker, *H. de l'E.* vol. xxiv. pp. 417–19.

[396] See the Proclamation of A.D. 1549, and the immediately succeeding Acts of 3 and 4 Edw. VI. c. x., ordaining that all books 'used heretofore for the service of the Church . . . shall be clearlie and utterlie abolished, extinguished, and forbidden for ever to bee used or kepte in this Realme.' They were further 'ordered to be openly burnt, or otherwise destroyed'; and if any mayor, bishop, &c., or other commissary, neglected to do so, he was to forfeit 'fourtie poundes.'—*Monum. Rit. Eccl. Angl.* vol. i. p. clxxiii.

How, it may be asked, in the face of so much apparent reverence for antiquity, could the new Missal and Breviary admit innovations that would imply the reverse? They were admitted on the very same grounds, and no others. They were but the expressions of what had been the devotional feelings of the whole Church—East and West alike—for centuries. And these devotional feelings had been called into existence by no ruling of councils, no decisions of theologians, and by no imposed observance. They had sprung up spontaneously and unbidden in the hearts of generation after generation of Christian men and women, devoting themselves, as best they could, through a life-long existence—soul and body—to the service of God, meditating day by day on the great work of redemption that had been wrought for them. And His Holy Spirit, communing with their spirits, and no other agent or instrument, had taught them that the Saints reigning with Christ, and His blessed Mother especially, could and would intercede for them, did they ask their prayers: and so one asked, and had his petitions granted, and asked again. Then he breathed the secret of his success to his brother or friend, till he in turn was encouraged to ask. Then another, and another, as the secret was passed about from house to hamlet, and from hamlet to town, and from one country to another, till at length it had spread over Christendom. Occasionally some signal cure, some miraculous deliverance, would be vouchsafed in answer to such prayers, that could not but be made public: then a public thanksgiving would follow; then it would be suggested, by some one bolder than the rest, why should not such blessings be asked for likewise in public, and in church, by a whole congregation—by a whole diocese? That was the first step to the formation of litanies, in which the intercessions, not of one Saint, but of many—at length of all—would be asked; and when their efficacy had been incontestably established by the palpable benefits which ensued from their use, they became part and parcel of the daily devotions of all pious Christians in all lands. The savage who drank of the water into which a certain tree had fallen found his strength won-

derfully restored, and he drank of it again and again, and told his neighbours, who followed his example; till at last the bark of that tree was recognised to have salutary properties, and was imported into highly civilised countries, and was taken up by the faculty, and scientific physicians prescribed it regularly, as one of the best medicines for restoring vigour to the human system. In no other way did devotions to the Saints spring up in the Church.[397] No pope, no general council, ever imposed them as obligatory. All that the Council of Trent even laid down on that subject was, that 'it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, aid, and help, for obtaining benefits from God through His Son Jesus Christ, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour.' This it was, therefore, that induced S. Pius to authorise insertion in his new Breviary of those forms of tender supplicatory address to the Blessed Virgin, which had proved the solace and edification of Christian men and women, of all orders and estates, for centuries. Public opinion demanded it of him—public opinion, based upon practical experience of their blessed effects. As it was said when the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was promulgated authoritatively by his present Holiness, that

[397] This is just the one fact which Dean Milman has left out; otherwise the abstract motives alleged by him are very candidly drawn: 'Of all these forms of worship' (which he had classed under the head of 'Christian Mythology'), 'the most captivating—and captivating to the most amiable weaknesses of the human mind—was the devotion to the Virgin Mary.'—*Lat. Christian.* b. iii. c. vii. p. 467. Elsewhere (ibid. c. iii. p. 140): 'The worship of the Virgin had arisen from the confluence of many pure and gentle, and many natural feelings. The reverence for everything connected with the Redeemer, especially by ties so close and tender, would not with cold jealousy watch and limit its ardent language. The more absolute deification, if it may be so said, of Christ—the forgetfulness of His Humanity, induced by His investment in more remote and awful Godhead—created a want of some more kindred and familiar object of adoration. The worship of the intermediate Saints admitted that of the Virgin as its least dangerous, most consolatory part. The exquisite beauty and purity of the images, the Virgin Mother and the Divine Infant, though not as yet embodied in the highest art, by painting or sculpture appealed to the unreasoning unsuspecting heart. To this was added the superior influence with which Christianity had invested the female sex, and which naturally clave to this gentler and kindred object of adoring love.'

decree satisfied yearnings that had been long felt by a whole world.[398]

The alternative lay, therefore, between giving expression and countenance to them in their most approved form, as was then done, and rejecting them as innovations, which historically they had long ceased to be, or as unedifying and unprofitable, which would have been contrary to fact, then as now. That there were innumerable abuses interwoven with the holiest of rites, and the most scriptural of observances, at that date, is acknowledged on all hands. What then? Did it follow that all the experiences of Christians, all the forms and books of devotion created by them, all over Christendom,[399] were to be treated as of no account? The English Prayer Book was compiled on the principle that for all that time Holy Scripture had been shamefully contravened or misinterpreted, and that its true meaning had only been recovered by those few English Divines who had broken with the teaching of their own national church, and of all other churches in communion with it. Taken at its best, the English Prayer Book professed to be one that SS. Irenæus or Cyprian would not have shrunk from using; but why, therefore, one that SS. Anselm or Bernard would have found defective? If these were not Saints, who were? Where is the authority for regarding the Fathers of the Primitive Church as Saints, and as understanding the Scriptures; and the Saints of the Mediæval Church as setting the Scriptures at nought, or ignorant of their true meaning? Intellectually, there were few then, and there are fewer now, to be

[398] 'Desideria totius orbis Christiani explevit.'

[399] Besides the sermons and devotional tracts of such distinguished saints as SS. Anselm and Bernard, representing the eleventh and twelfth centuries, let me refer to the list of Service Books of the English Church alone, given by Mr. Maskell, *Monum. Rit. Eccl. Angl.* vol. i. pp. cxciv.–vi.—amounting to no less than ninety. Of one of them, *Horæ Beatæ Virginis Mariæ*, he says, p. clii.: 'More copies are to be found in public and private libraries than of any other service-book of the English Church. . . . Strictly speaking it was not a service-book of the Church, but originally compiled and intended for the use of the laity.' Mr. M. estimates the whole number of Service Books then in use in England at 250,000.—Ibid. clxviii. note.

named with S. Anselm: and of his God-serving ways and holy life who can doubt? Besides, he had risen to be primate of the English Church; and his predecessors before him in that exalted post, and his successors after him, down to the fell sixteenth century, thought as he did, and worshipped as he did, in all these respects. From the days of S. Augustine, the first archbishop of Canterbury, to the days of Cranmer, with so many blots on his character as a prelate and as a man, can any one age be mentioned, previously to the sixteenth century, when the Book of Common Prayer would have been accepted by the English Church as embodying and expressing that whole sum of Christian doctrine in which all had been taught themselves, and in which they thought it their duty to see posterity instructed?

§ 87. *Character of the Thirty-nine Articles. Grave Breach with the Past.*

From which remark I pass straight to the Thirty-nine Articles, because they do not stop there but go some steps further in advance. The Prayer Book condemns rather by implication, and by its silence. The Articles attack openly, and with no small virulence, doctrines and practices which, till then, had been current in the English Church and in the West generally. They may not have been framed in overt hostility to the Decrees of Trent, whose actual promulgation they just anticipated. They may not have been copied from the Confession of Augsburg, which came out so much earlier, or by the Synod of Dort, which followed so much later; but they established a breach with the past equally grave and premeditated, and which in all English constitutional history, from Egbert to Queen Victoria, can have but one name—Treason!

Previously to their publication, or rather previously to that rupture with Rome which led to it, the Church of England had for upwards of 1,200 years—almost twice as long as England had then been a monarchy—been associated by federal ties of the closest nature with that world-wide corporation

known as the Catholic Church, and had participated to the fullest extent in all its vicissitudes and successive developments. As far back as A.D. 347, bishops from Britain are mentioned as having been present at the Council of Sardica, where they must have been parties to those canons authorising appeals in certain cases to the see of Rome; and where, from the very nature of the case, they could not fail to have heard that earlier canon talked about, of which the historian of the Greek Church, Socrates, speaks,[400] declaring it unlawful for any local churches to make canons against the will of the bishop of that see. Twelve years from that date they were congratulated by S. Hilary on having preserved their orthodoxy; two years more, and they were noticed at the Council of Rimini. The century following, aided by two bishops from France, they made common cause with the rest of the Church against Pelagianism.[401] Before the end of the next century, S. Augustine had founded the see of Canterbury, which in process of time came to be acknowledged as the metropolitan church of the whole island, and even of Ireland as we have seen. The bishops of Scotland for a time went to York, and the bishops of Ireland to Canterbury, for consecration. The archbishops of Canterbury, without one exception, for nine centuries and upwards, among the sixty-three who held that see down to Cranmer inclusive, received their palls from Rome.

When East and West separated, it was the Primate of all England who, by command of the Pope, undertook the cause of the whole West, before a synod held in its extreme frontier-town on the Italian coast—Bari. When East and West were thought to have been happily reunited once more, tidings were sent to, and congratulatory letters were received from, and public rejoicings throughout his dominions were decreed by, the youthful King of England, Henry VI.: copies of which exist still in the archiepiscopal archives,[402] in token that the

[400] See above, p. 33, note.

[401] Collier, *E. H.* vol. i. pp. 69–112. His remarks on the Sardican Canons are special-pleading.

[402] Lambeth, 211, Nos. 98, 99. The first is dated 'Our Camp at Windsor,' A.D. 1439, Oct. 3, and is on the reunion of the Greeks; the second is

heart of England beat in active sympathy with the rest of Christendom. It was not merely that the see of Canterbury was mindful of its primeval obligations, or its canonical duties to the see of Rome. No General Council was ever summoned from which the bishops of England were left out: no General Council ever promulgated any decrees, which from the time of their acceptance in England were not made part-and-parcel of the ecclesiastical law of that realm. Now and then there were delays in recognising a pope, or in accepting the decrees of a council—as, for instance, of Basle. Now and then there were the usual disputes in connection with both, incidental to the parts of every corporate body.

Such had been the prescriptive rights and obligations of the Church of England for upwards of 1,200 years, when the Prayer Book was compiled, and the Thirty-nine Articles promulgated as its future doctrinal tests. There had been a quarrel between one king of England, Henry VIII., and one pope, Clement VII., of a personal character, affecting at most the domestic happiness of the former; just as there must always be when individuals involve themselves in any civil or ecclesiastical suit, and it had proceeded to extremities on both sides. But never had the Pope threatened any encroachments, then, on the abstract rights of the Crown; still less had there been any attack on the liberties of the Church of England. There had been no new doctrine promulgated, nor any new discipline enjoined for acceptance by it. Because a monarch, so notoriously singular as Henry VIII. in his matrimonial arrangements, had been thwarted in them, the Church of England assented to abjure the supremacy of the Pope in that reign; to burn and destroy all its time-honoured rituals for celebrating Divine service in the next; and then, after a few years of feigned repentance under Mary, reproduced, under Elizabeth, its new 'Service Book' and Articles of 'Religion:' not only without the smallest reference to the opinions of the rest of Christendom, but in open defiance of

earlier, 'From Reading Convent,' Feb. 8, A.D. 1439, and is on the reunion of the Armenians with the Western Church.

the General Council of the West, then actually sitting, and to which its bishops among others had, in conformity with ancient usage, received their summons—all which it justified on the ground that it had resolved, for the future, to be quit of the Pope.

Now, even at this point it might have halted, without any further outrage upon the constitutional prerogatives of every corporate society. It scorned the idea of any such moderation. Transubstantiation, which for more than three centuries it had held and taught, in conformity with the Fourth Lateran Council, it now condemned as 'repugnant to the plain words of Scripture.'[403] Purgatory, which it had maintained with the Council of Florence against the Greek doctrine on that subject, it now discarded as 'a vain invention.'[404] Restriction of the cup to the celebrant priest, which it had received from the Council of Constance, it now asserted to be contrary to 'Christ's ordinance.'[405] Celibacy of the clergy, which in common with the rest of the West had been its own discipline from time immemorial, it now declared it to be lawful to depart from, though no other Western Church had relaxed that rule.[406] To teach that there were seven sacraments, as all previous archbishops of York and Canterbury must have done more or less, it now regarded as a product of 'the corrupt following of the Apostles.'[407] To ask for the prayers of the Saints in heaven, to venerate their relics and images on earth, as the Church of Rome did, it affirmed to be 'repugnant to the Word of God;'[408] though its old office-books alone showed how identical had been its own authorised practice, from the Norman Conquest at latest. Finally, in consenting to abandon appeals to Rome, it repudiated not merely one of the first principles of its own Canon Law, but likewise one of the earliest synodical acts on record of its own primitive bishops, above 1,200 years previously, who sat and voted at that council which authorised them. All this it did without so much as asking counsel or inviting

[403] Art. xxviii.
[404] Art. xxii.
[405] Art. xxx.
[406] Art. xxxii.
[407] Art. xxv.
[408] Art. xxii.

criticism from any one of the local churches in Europe—with all which it had for so long been united as one family—on the wisdom or justice of its proceedings. The only foreigners whom it condescended to consult at all were those who had unchurched themselves. In that one respect, that of taking a bold line of its own, it may have acted as England usually does: in all other respects how thoroughly un-English was the course pursued! The questions which it reopened and the points which it retracted had no reference to the decrees of any one council that had been held, or to any one dogma that had been put forward, of late years. France was slow to accept the Council of Trent from the first, and has never accepted it wholly to this day. All the Trullan Canons, and even the three last canons of the Council of Chalcedon, were rejected by the Holy See, and have never since been received. The Greeks demurred to the addition of the words 'Filioque' to the creed at once, and have never really given in. But here was a local church arrogating to set aside doctrines and practices of the collective Church—which it had for ages accepted, inculcated, and enforced itself—on the ground principally that they were 'repugnant to the Word of God;' but only, therefore, as interpreted by its own living authorities of that one period. What must have been the unavoidable inference suggested to the minds of all intelligent thinkers? If for five, if for ten centuries all the bishops and theologians of the collective Church were proved to have known nothing of the true meaning of the Word of God, how many degrees below nothing might the living authorities of one local church of a single age be supposed to rank in their estimate of the same? Had each of the English counties taken that view of their constitutional obligations in the sixteenth century, what would have been the condition of Old England now? Had each of the churches of Europe followed the example of the Church of England, what would have become of the unity of the Catholic Church by this time?

§ 88. *Present Position of the Church of England no mere Quarrel with Rome.*

What prejudices we must have been brought up in, to have ever looked upon the present position of the Church of England as the result of a mere quarrel with or protest against Rome! It was a breach with our forefathers, and with the entire Western Church, past and present. The Parliament of the collective West was sitting, and had sat for some years. Why did not the bishops of the Church of England attend it, both to give counsel as to what had best be done for others, and to take counsel as to what had best be done for themselves? This surely, as members of that legislature (which they were) they were bound to do? Duty required of them that they should make no changes in their profession or practice of which their brethren would not approve: charity required of them that they should assist their brethren in deciding what changes would be most beneficial for the common good. Instead of attending that Parliament, they threw overboard all former Acts of Parliament which had hitherto guided both them and their forefathers. 'General Councils,' they said, 'may err.'[409] Be it so. But who could make laws for Christendom if General Councils could not? Did they, notwithstanding their collective wisdom, decree what was repugnant to the Word of God, how could it be expected that what the authorities of a local church decreed would be more free from error? It has been—it is still—the same contradiction that it was then. Holy Scripture is a book, and must have its interpreter. The Divines of the Church of England have interpreted the Bible for three centuries in their own way; the Divines of all the churches in communion with Rome have for three centuries upheld that interpretation which had been given to it by the whole West from time immemorial—the Church of England included—till the sixteenth century. Controversy has not converted a single local church elsewhere to the opinions advanced from that

[409] Art. xxi.

time forth by the Anglican Church. It is the judgment of the local Church of England for three centuries, against that of the local Church of England for twelve, against that of the rest of the West for all time preceding our own, on the points under dispute. And the East, where it has spoken at all, has pronounced for the latter. It passes my comprehension to understand how the authorities of any local church, so acting, should dream of being looked upon otherwise than as schismatical by the rest of the community with which they had been for so many centuries united, and as traitors to it by its supreme Head. Subordination to constituted authorities is the mainspring of all societies, and the result of any infraction of it by any part of them is schism. Schism, plainly, is never the act of a body, but of any part or parts separating from the body. We could not say that Great Britain revolted from the United States when they declared themselves independent. Heresy moreover, unless that word is to be reserved exclusively for theological aberrations, is incurred by any deliberate abandonment of the received belief. Now though, with Luther, the authorities of the Church of England may never have repudiated the dogmatic theology of the East, with Luther they undoubtedly discarded the whole system of anthropological teaching laid down by the West in respect of the Sacraments. With Luther they absented themselves from that Council in which subjective anthropology was to be discussed and ruled. They arrogated, with Luther, to define that branch of Christian doctrine for themselves; and it is precisely here where their agreement ends. The teaching of the Church of England on that head is unique. It neither satisfied Luther nor Calvin. It only served to widen the breach which its own acts had established between it and the rest of the West.

S. Thomas, in the third part of his elaborate work,[410] has not failed to consider the question whether heretical, schismatical, and excommunicate priests have power to consecrate the Holy Eucharist; and his reply is in the affirmative.

[410] *Sum. Theol.* p. iii. q. lxxxii. art. vii.

Those who have been ordained within the Church have received their power lawfully; which afterwards, however, should they be separated from the Church by heresy, schism, or excommunication, they can no longer exercise lawfully. Those who have been ordained thus separated, have received their power unlawfully, and any exercise of it by them is unlawful. Their consecration of the Holy Eucharist is therefore a true consecration; but it is unprofitable, and not without taint of sin, analogous to the case of those who have been unworthy communicants.

One or other of these, clearly, was the formal position of those four bishops who consecrated Parker; and of Parker still more, who was consecrated by them. The fact of their separation from the Church is no less patent than that they had deliberately embraced that state with their eyes open, for the reign of Mary was only just over. Their orders, unimpeachable as they may be in point of succession, were as indisputably given and received in schism in point of fact. There can be no such thing, not merely with reference to the Church, but to the organisation of society generally, as schism if theirs was not. And it would be hard, I fear, to prove that the consecrators of Archbishop Parker meant no schism, or that the practical effect of their act has been the perpetuation of schism. Have their descendants always meant schism in the same degree? In other words, what has the Church of England been doing ever since? Trees are known by their fruits—a man by his works. Illegitimate birth may be a disgrace, but it has before now contributed saints; and even heretical baptism is held to confer regeneration or new birth.

§ 89. *Examination continued on 'à posteriori' Grounds. Peculiarities of the Church of England.*

On *à posteriori* grounds, therefore, what may be said for or against the Church of England onwards from the sixteenth century? Now, there are certain peculiarities of mind and body, and there are certain maladies likewise, which children are said to inherit from their parents. It appears

to me that the Church of England exhibits two or three such phenomena, of a very marked kind.

(*a*) As it assumed a position of isolation and nationality from the first, so its benefits, whatever they may have been, have never extended themselves beyond what may be called its own immediate circle. No other nation except its own colonial offshoots, speaking the same language, has ever adopted its Prayer Book or Thirty-nine Articles. Innumerable attempts were made, as I shall hope to show in a second volume, to get the English Ritual adopted abroad, and have bishops consecrated in England for Germany; but they never succeeded. So far Calvinism, which made a conquest of Scotland, and Lutheranism still more, by making a conquest of the Scandinavian nations, eclipsed Anglicanism. Anglicanism has, indeed, spread over a far wider range than either, but as the religion of Englishmen in all cases. It has its chapels all over the world, but they were never once founded for foreigners. It has sent missionaries in numbers to the heathen: but when we come to analyse the scene of their labours, we find it, with perhaps the single exception of Central Africa, limited to some portion of territory over which the British flag waves. It must be conceded that such has never been the characteristic of Roman Catholic missions, though they have by no means ever neglected European settlements in any part of the world, including even the dependencies of Great Britain.

(*b*) A second phenomenon connected with the Anglican Church is that, as it began by casting off authority, so it has never been able to speak or act with any real authority from that time forth. To the domination of Presbyterianism in Scotland it was obliged to assent for the peace of the realm. Puritanism in England it could only keep down, as it had put down Roman Catholicism, by those truculent ordinances which so long disgraced our Statute-book. As soon as ever these were mitigated or removed, Dissent burst forth in innumerable forms—more so, perhaps, than had ever been known in any Christian country previously — and carried away millions; and Roman Catholicism instantly revived and

expanded on all sides, though the number of its actual professors had been reduced to the barest fraction.

But then it was just in that very lack of authoritative claims that the true character of the mission of the Church of England came out. It was destined to do for authority what authority could not, in logic, have done for itself—to establish inductively, one by one, the details of each of those premisses involving, as their conclusion, the major premiss of that deductive syllogism, which is the formal expression of all authority in the Church, as has been before shown. We must consider all Christians alike interested in the Evidences, historical or argumentative, of that religion on which their hopes of heaven are built. And there have been writers on the Evidences of Christianity—most accomplished and effective writers, certainly—who h ve not been members of the Church of England. Still, it is undeniable that the Church of England furnished a very large proportion of them, and some of the ablest. No collection of them would be complete in which the works of Sherlock and Leslie, West and Lyttelton, Watson and Bentley, Berkeley and Douglas, Horsley and Paley, were not conspicuous. Such works as the 'Horæ Paulinæ' and 'Scriptural Coincidences' should have a place to themselves, as containing not only original but valid argument for all time. And the immortal 'Analogy'—the only work of the kind, at home or abroad, compelling a man to deny nature, or believe Christianity, on grounds which reason cannot dispute—should be reserved, in solitary grandeur, for a separate volume, as the intermediate stage in logic to the second premiss above mentioned, that it is Christianity and nothing else that is taught by the Church.

It is this part of the proof which, I contend, has been exclusively Anglican. Negative arguments were the characteristic of writers upon Evidences. Here the positions begin to be positive, as they are laid down one by one. The most curious part of it all is, that the work most largely positive in argument, and most comprehensive in subject, should have been composed within twenty-five years of the schism; yet who would affirm it to have been composed in any schismati-

cal spirit? the eight books of 'Ecclesiastical Polity' by plain Richard Hooker! Certainly, it is a noble plea for church-government in the abstract that has never been surpassed, and a vindication of the rights of episcopacy in particular. How many more—Hall, Thorndike, Brett, Potter, for instance—have followed him on the same side, whether upon the details of church-government, or episcopacy as a Divine institution? Then, on Infant Baptism, there is Wall; on the Unbloody Sacrifice there is Johnson; on the Creeds there are Pearson and Jackson; on the Doctrine of the Nicene Fathers there are Bull and Waterland. Must I not, in justice, go further? Where are there more profound views on Baptismal Regeneration than in the works of Dr. Pusey; on the Incarnation and the Holy Eucharist than in the works of the late Archdeacon Wilberforce, for such he was when they were written; on Justification, by the late Vicar of S. Mary-the-Virgin, Oxford; on the Doctrinal Differences between Greeks and Latins, by the late Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford—Mr. W. Palmer? It may be that the Church of England has not yet done all that has to be done still in these respects, and that other points, equally necessary, are still requiring their inductive proof. As it cannot possibly be said that Baptismal Regeneration is not better understood, or more extensively believed in it, since the Gorham controversy, or the Real Presence since judgment was given in the case of Archdeacon Denison; so discussions on the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, and the doctrine of Eternal Punishment, possibly may not terminate without establishing anew those very truths which have been assailed. And who can tell whether Unity of the Church under the Pope may not be one of the next points argued? Never, as yet, has it been argued by any member of the Church of England on its own merits, or apart from prejudice. That there has been a vast deal of learning expended in attacking the Pope I do not deny; but, in spite of it all, there is one fact which has never yet been looked in the face as it should be. Christendom separated from the Holy See is divided into endless communities, disagreeing with each other, no two of them ever able to be joined in one: Christendom in communion

with the Holy See has never existed, exists nowhere, but as One Church.[411] Never was the truth of the promise made by Our Lord to S. Peter more signally elucidated than by the inevitable contrast now forced upon our own eyes between divided Christendom and the undivided Church. By that honesty for which Englishmen are characterised, may that Unity be the next point argued. Certainly, where so much has been done of late years, where so much more in appearance is now doing than there was even twenty years ago, there are some grounds for hope.

Meanwhile, what description of lives have individuals been leading generally in the Church of England? Here is another of those marked phenomena which have been already noticed. Anglicanism has produced but few instances of superhuman saintliness; yet it has maintained throughout a consistent level of its own, and that by no means a low one. Its Farrars and Edward Stephenses of former days are easily numbered; not so its Hookers and its Waltons, its Lauds and Hammonds, its Evelyns and Nelsons, its Kens, Wilsons, and Hebers. The devotional works upon which they fed, the practical piety which distinguished their lives, have become in many cases historical. And there are thousands—hundreds of thousands of men and women now living and working in the Church of England, of whom some modern Gregory might say, with infinitely more truth than was said originally, 'Non Angli sed Angeli, si forent Catholici.' On their charitable works, often of princely munificence, in town and in country, and beyond seas; on their Christian homes, and family prayers, and Christian Sundays—their love of truth, their high intelligence, their reverence for the Scriptures, in spite of all their peculiarities or shortcomings, he must have a

[411] As Grotius has so well put it: 'Gradus præpositorum in Ecclesiâ esse debere, et per illos compaginari Ecclesiam docuit nos Paulus: Ephes. iv. 2. Ordo sive in partibus, sive in toto, continetur principatu quodam, sive præpositi unitate. . . . Tale caput est inter presbyteros episcopus, inter episcopos metropolitanus, aut alio quis modo electus, ut cæteris præsit. Tale inter omnes episcopos episcopus Romanus. *Hic ordo in Ecclesiâ semper manere debet, quia semper manet causa, id est periculum a schismate.*'—*Votum pro Pac. Eccl.* art. vii. p. 41.

jaundiced heart, or a heart of stone indeed, who can look without far more emotion than is said to have been that of our venerable Apostle of old as he gazed upon those fair-haired and blue-eyed countenances exposed for sale.

§ 90. *Schism and its extenuating Circumstances. Conscientiousness on both Sides.*

Clement XI. was so struck with the proofs of learning and piety which he found in the private letters of Archbishop Wake, that he lamented that so great and good a man should not have been on his side. We may ask—we are imperatively bound to ask—can schism have produced these results? Who will undertake to strike the balance between causes and effects? I feel as sure of my facts in one case as in the other; and yet, evidently, they require squaring of some sort to make them tally. Either schism can be no obstacle to a vast amount of Christian zeal and piety, or the Church of England is not in schism. What if its schism has not been so decided in guilt as it appears in fact? I point out what it seems to me may have been its extenuating circumstances; I leave it to others to determine their precise value.

(*a*) The dreadful demoralisation of those centuries—the fourteenth and the fifteenth—which Father Dalgairns has not hesitated to call 'terrible,' and the delay which intervened before any reforms were so much as proposed, stand at the head of them. When I reflect on the assistance and solace which I derive from living communion with the Saints—from asking for, and feeling that I have, their prayers, and am benefited by them—from praying for the dear friends and relatives, though they may have died members of the Church of England, that have been taken from me—from the blessedness of communing with Christ, ever present in the Holy Eucharist—from the constant practice of confession—from the feeling that I belong to a Church of all nations and languages, and to be found in all parts of the world, in dependence on that See to whose prerogatives all antiquity bears witness in some form or other, so that I can now read church-history without

experiencing any qualm that I am in that respect dealing unfaithfully with antiquity: when I reflect upon all this, so plain and rational, and consistent with Scripture, so confirmed to me by daily experience; and then, when I remember that these were the very points which so many good men—for there were good men among them, the pious Founder of my old College, for instance, as he sits there appealing to me, careworn and contemplative, in his Benedictine habit, to name no more—abandoned, and which for three centuries so many devout earnest men in the whole Protestant world have positively shrunk from as unclean, I am amazed and aghast! I can only account for the anomaly by calling to mind those corruptions, and trying to estimate the amount of wickedness and defilement requisite for converting so many holy things into so many real scandals, and causing them to be made the stumblingblocks which they were then to so many, and have been ever since to so many, millions of baptized and professing Christians. 'The contest' between Catholics and Protestants, says Moehler, with glorious impartiality, 'sprang out of the most earnest endeavours of both parties to uphold the truth—the pure and genuine Christianity in all its integrity.'[412] Of the good men on both sides, every fresh page of history that I read convinces me that there never was a truer thing said. 'Men who died on both sides—as Protestants as well as Catholics, and Catholics no less than Protestants—have died, in numbers and in ways too painful to be dwelt upon, with firm unswerving faith in the absolute truth of those principles for which they suffered—should be regarded by both sides with unfeigned respect and regret; and may we not hope that their blood may in some way atone for our mutual sins? The zeal of Protestants has been for the authority of the Bible, the zeal of Catholics for the authority of the Church—one founded, the other inspired, by God! Who ought not to be profoundly moved and distressed at the thought that these were the principles for which Christian blood has been shed on both sides, and in such profusion?

[412] See *sup.* note to p. 170.

This, then, is one excuse that I would make for Protestants and Anglicans alike.

(*b*) There is another excuse peculiar to the Church of England, and it is even more serious: I mean the nature of the attempts that have been made from time to time by Catholics, individually or collectively, to regain ascendancy for the Catholic religion in this country. Severe criticism of some of the earliest and most formal of them all, and which were never repeated from that time forth, is to be found in the words of the very highest authority to which I could appeal.

'We know,' said Urban VIII. to Cardinal Borgia, 'that we may declare Protestants excommunicate, as Pius V. declared Queen Elizabeth, and before him Clement VII. the King of England . . . Henry VIII., but with what success? *The whole world can tell: we yet bewail it in tears of blood.* Wisdom doth not teach us to imitate Pius V. or Clement VII. . . .'[413]

In the defeat of the Spanish Armada, though it did not take place for more than twenty years afterwards—in the successful organisation of the Church of England, we may, perhaps, be able to decipher the answer of events to that excommunication and deposition of Elizabeth. All the plots which had been fomented against her government during that time, by Sanders[414] and others, culminated in that invasion, though they by no means subsided with it. And it was just about that time that, under Whitgift and Hooker, the Church of England learnt to speak and act for itself with a consciousness of inherent vigour and independence. The Gunpowder Plot in the reign of James I. dashed to the ground all hopes of any reconciliation with Rome under the two first of the Stuarts—both as much inclined to it[415] as could possibly have

[413] Quoted by Mr. Simpson in *Bp. Ullathorne and the Rambler* (Williams and Norgate, London, 1862), near the end. (From a contemporary Report preserved in the State Paper Office, Charles I., Italy, Bundle 24): 'It was thus we lost England,' said Pius IV., in a similar strain of lament as reported by Ranke, vol. i. p. 332, Mrs. Austin's *Tr.*

[414] See the extracts from his own letter, Collier, *E. H.* vol. vii. p. 20, ed. Straker.

[415] See Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes*, § 7, c. ii. b. vii., where it is said, among other things: 'The Puritans

been expected of any absolute monarchs: the mad policy and illegal measures of James II. annihilated at one blow all the progress which the Catholic cause had been making amongst individuals up to that time, and almost laid its adherents under a general sentence of outlawry from society from that time forth. Whom, indeed, had Catholics here, in the seventeenth century, to thank but themselves, above all others, as for their first so for their final discomfiture? They began and ended by quarrelling among themselves.[416] In the days of James I. seculars and regulars contended over the appointment of bishops. Through the exertions of the former, one was created by the special bull of Urban VIII., dated Aug. 4, A.D. 1625, and despatched into England.[417] He

complained that within a short time 50,000 Englishmen had become proselytes to Catholicism; to which James is said to have replied, "that they might go and convert the same number of Spaniards and Italians."'

[416] Among the many records of it may be selected:

1. 'Declaratio motuum ac turbationum, quæ ex controversiis inter Jesuitas, iisque in omnibus faventem D. G. Blackwellum, archipresbyterum: et sacerdotes seminariorum in Angliâ, ab obitu Illmi. Cardinalis Alani piæ memoriæ ad A.D. usque 1601, ad S. D. N. Clementem VIII. exhibitum ab ipsis sacerdotibus, qui schismatis aliorumque criminum insimulati sunt.'—Rhotomagi. A.D. 1601.

2. 'A true Relation of the Faction begun at Wisbich by F. Edmonds (*alias* Weston), a Jesuit, A.D. 1595 . . . against us the Secular Priests, their Brethren and Fellow-Prisoners' (by C. Bagshawe, Wood's *Ath. Oxon.* vol. ii. p. 390, ed. Bliss).

3. N. le Maistre's *Instauratio Antiqui Episcoporum Principatûs*, Paris, 1632.

4. Loemelin's *Defensio Decreti Congregationis Cardinalium ab Urbano VIII. pro Suppressione Librorum in Controversiâ Episcopi Chalcedonis deputatæ.*

5. Loemelin's *Spongia contra Censuram Facultatis Parisiensis*, &c. Both printed at Antwerp; and occasioning the work of Le Maistre. And for the general subject—Rushworth's *Hist. Coll.* vol. ii. p. 15; Wood's *Ath. Oxon.* vol. ii. p. 356, and vol. iii. p. 384; Dodd's *Ch. Hist.* vol. iii.

[417] His name was Richard Smith. There had been a former Bishop of Chalcedon resident in England, named William Bishop, who died A.D. 1624. A curious notice of him occurs in vol. xlvi. of Dr. Rawlinson's *Miscell. Papers* in the Bodleian Library, towards the end, taken from the *Bin. Register*—possibly the only pleasant memorial in connection with the see of Chalcedon in England: 'A.D. 1624, April 13, obiit juxta Londinum Reverendissimus in Christo Pater Dominus Gulielmus Bishop de Brailes in Comit. Warwick. Episcopus Calcedoniensis, carceribus, exilio, ac Apostolicis sudoribus, inclitus; qui a Sanctâ Sede in patriam ad solamen Catholicorum missus, *clericis, regularibus, ac ipsis laicis, ob innatum unionis ac pacis affectum juxta charus extitit, Ætat. suæ* 71.'

was received with murmurs and driven out by intrigues. The 'sponge' designed to wipe out the censure with which the University of Paris had visited two books written in England against Episcopacy, but not by Puritans, can never efface the shame of that controversy. Intrigues were the order of the day. Was the Church of England ever animated by friendly dispositions towards the Church of Rome, they were repelled with scorn. Did individuals on the Catholic side manifest any friendly dispositions to the Church of England, they were traduced as heretics. 'The little Archbishop of Canterbury he could not endure,' says Arthur Wilson, of Father Weston; though what brought Laud to the scaffold, principally, was his correspondence with Catholics. 'I know the man: he is one of Canterbury's trencher-flies, and eats perpetually at his table—a creature of his making,' returned Father Weston to Arthur Wilson's enquiries about Sancta Clara,[418] who had merely anticipated the attempt of the last of the 'Tracts for the Times,' within memory, to establish a harmony between the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England and the Creed of the West. 'It was happy for the Roman Catholics,' said the President of the English College at Rome, of the Archbishop of Canterbury, four years after his murder, 'that he was cut off . . . but now, by his death, the growth of heresy would bring all into confusion, so he hoped in time England would embrace the Romish religion.'[419] Naturally enough, he hoped in vain. 'I mourn over the Archbishop of Canterbury,' said the high-souled Grotius, 'a most excellent and learned man. . . . It is a great proof of his innocence that he was made the victim of so much malevolence.'[420] As if the persecution of all orders by the State was not bitter enough, one order attacked another with such virulence, that upon one occasion the writings of Father Baker, one of the most

[418] Peck's *Desid. Curios.* vol. ii. b. xii. p. 22. The conversation took place at Bruges, where Wilson was then halting, in A.D. 1637. Compare Father Leander's letters generally; Clarendon, *State Papers*, vol. i.

[419] Rawl. *Miscell. Papers*, vol. i. Fragment of a Journey to Rome in company with Messrs. Holdip and Bulteel (Lord Hyde's secretary), dated Oct. 4, A.D. 1648.

[420] *Ep. ad Frat.* 532 and 708.

spiritual of all the converts of that date, were proscribed, as containing 'poisonous and diabolical doctrine.'[421] Finally, the prosecution of the seven Anglican bishops[422] was one of the means for conciliating England adopted by James II. to his cost. But all his remonstrances, all his services as he considered them, could not extort from the Pope that approval of his policy which he so much coveted, in the shape of a cardinal's hat for Father Petre.[423] 'It is a thing unseen, unheard-of, and unrecorded in History,' says the writer of a letter which fell into Archbishop Sancroft's hands during the first month of the Revolution of A.D. 1688, well qualified to pass judgment on it, 'that a king in peaceful possession of his realm, with an army of 30,000 fighting men, and forty ships of war, should quit his kingdom without firing a pistol . . . . It looks as if heaven and earth had conspired against us! But this is not all—the great evil comes from ourselves. Our own imprudence, avarice, and ambition have brought all this upon us . . . The prospect was fair, if the business had been in the hands of men of sense . . . We are totally put to the rout this time . . . Bishops, confessors, friars, and monks have acted with little prudence' . . .[424]

May we prove wiser in our generation! Our destinies were never more completely in our own hands than they are now: we never were more free. Our countrymen are fast parting with their prejudices against us: may we be equally large-hearted towards them, and towards each other! With the stern lessons of those memorable epochs of A.D. 1588 and A.D. 1688 before our eyes, it seems only reasonable to hope

[421] Rawl. *A.* 36. Letters of Catherine Gascoigne, Abbess of Cambray, written in A.D. 1625, on the proceedings of Claude White, Benedictine President.

[422] 'An event,' says Lord Macaulay, 'which stands by itself in our history'—as certainly does his description of it (c. viii.) in his.

[423] Ibid. c. vi. generally; and the end of c. vii.

[424] Printed in Italian and English, pp. 505–6 of vol. ii of Singer's *Correspondence of Henry Hyde;* a copy in MS. in the Bodleian Library, *Tanner Papers*, xxviii. fol. 278. It bears date, 'London, Dec. 10, 1688.' The Father Conn (or Cann) who wrote it was not the Nuncio—long since dead—but the Father of that name mentioned in connexion with Cardinal Howard: p. 46, of *Three Letters* from Italy, printed as a supplement to Burnet.

that we may be found pledged to a much more popular system of tactics in A.D. 1888, with its triplet of eights—our 'third and last time of asking,' possibly—who can tell?

(*c*) Another excuse which may be made for the Church of England is its occasional oppression, in past and present time, by the Crown. To some extent it has submitted, and is so far responsible. But yet it has never, like Lutheranism and Calvinism, since Parker's consecration, consented to look upon its priests and bishops as so many Crown-agents. Henry VIII. certainly employed force to effect the rupture between it and the Pope—Elizabeth to effect the adoption by it of a new liturgy. Anyone who has studied its history with impartiality must admit that it was partly forced and partly cajoled into the line which eventually it adopted as its own. That adoption I by no means intend to justify—still less the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings, as interpreted by some of its ablest prelates. Neither, on the other hand, would I for a moment be understood to deny that its connection with the State—though in many respects far too like Erastianism—has, on the whole, contributed to that Christian tone which has so long distinguished, and which I trust is not departing from, English society and English literature generally throughout the length and breadth of the land.

(*d*) The fourth and last excuse for the Church of England—the most important by far to my mind—is to be found in the Providential task which seems to have been assigned to it, of rebuilding up Christian truth in the manner already described. Are we not bound to hope that the guilt of schism, in the case of our wellbeloved country, has not been so incontestable as the fact, that what there has been admits of palliation, and that some portion of it at least may be looked upon as having been blotted out? Let us look at it all in that general spirit of charity which prompted the Catholic Church, sooner than that souls should be lost to Christ, to accept the baptism of heretics as valid. Let us reciprocate that generosity which has been gradually restoring Catholics in this country to their full rights as citizens, without requiring them to abjure the Pope—which commenced, in fact, by re-

storing the Pope to his own rights—throwing ourselves into those feelings which animated that noble confessor Pius VII., when he spoke of it to our brethren across the water: 'Remember . . . that the British Government was amongst the chief of our supporters in procuring our return to the Pontifical chair, and our restoration to our ancient independence in the exercise of those spiritual rights which the hand of violence had wrested from us'[425] . . . and with gratitude excited by the memories of those priests and bishops of the Catholic Church who found in England a home, and a welcome even from the Anglican Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, when France, no longer Catholic, thirsted for their blood, and to whose peaceful abode here the Catholic reaction of the present century has been so often traced.

If there has been anything Providential in the destinies of the Church of England, why should we persist in shutting our eyes to it? If there has been anything Providential in the particular kind of work which has been done by it, why not hail it with all thankfulness? Shall we not insist upon its defects—its entire isolation; its only too patent want of authority; the absence from it of the higher types of saintliness; above all, the uncertainty which must attend its every celebration of the Holy Eucharist, as to how far, being in schism, it may not involve sin in the sight of God—with infinitely more force when we have frankly admitted both all the good that is in it, and any services that it may have performed in behalf of our common religion? Christian England ought to be eternally grateful to Rome for having adhered rigidly and unyieldingly, for three centuries, to the whole sum of Christian doctrine, which Fathers had taught, and Councils had from age to age defined—for having preserved the unity of the Catholic Church, as it has done, unbroken, and for having upheld its authority. Still, in vindicating Christianity from the objections that have been made to it, in maintaining in its integrity that part of the hierarchy which is essential to the valid administration of the sacra-

[425] Butler's *Historical Memoirs*, vol. ii. p. 423: Letter addressed to the Irish Prelates, A.D. 1816.

ments, and in contending for the truth of one article of our creed after another, England has done considerable service—far more than ever enters the minds of those who take into account only the isolated position of its insular Church.

§ 91. *Hidden Sympathy between England and Rome. Catholics and Protestants Brethren by Baptism.*

The truth is—in spite of their avowed antagonism—there is and has always been a hidden sympathy between England and Rome, which is symbolised in the characteristics of the inductive and deductive methods. Both are endeavouring to assure the preservation of truth from different points of view; the general policy of both is conservative. Religion is the chief concern of the State at Rome: on no question is public opinion half so sensitive in England as a religious one. The desire of all evildoers and irreligious thinkers must ever be to aggravate and perpetuate their estrangement: the true friends of Christianity, unless they are blinded by prejudice, must always long to see them reunited. The dangers menacing the Church of England, and those menacing the Church of Rome, proceed from a common source; but the temporalities of both would be secured for many a long day by their cordial alliance.

Let Protestants, as Moehler says,[426] acknowledge their present errors, and Catholics their past corruptions; and let both take to heart the causes which have divided them, and labour to be more fair to each other. Let the East accept the anthropological teaching of the West, as the West has accepted the theological teaching of the East, without any reserve, and all may be healed; and Christendom and the Church may become synonymous terms once more, to the great joy of all hearts, and to the conversion of unbelievers in all lands.

This may or may not be in our generation: it may never be at all. It is indescribable how many advantages there are within our reach, positively offering themselves to our culling—as individuals, as families, and as Christians—from which we

[426] *Symb.* vol. ii. pp. 31–2.

cut ourselves off deliberately, by our own acts, either through unwillingness to own ourselves in the wrong, and appear or be indebted to our neighbours; or else from prejudice or over-strained principle. It is so long since Christendom has been united, that though East and West were united, at least as long as they have have been divided, and though West has not been divided one-fifth of the time when it was knit together as one family, we have grown accustomed to the spectacle, and ask ourselves whether it would not be presumptuous to attempt reversing what has been law now for so many centuries. Others there are who think that Christendom can never be reconciled without some sacrifice of principle somewhere, so as to be dear at the price. How can Catholics, for instance, give up the principle of authority, or Protestants that of private judgment and free enquiry? As if enquiry must go on for ever enquiring, or authority be for ever disputed! Still, let any attempt be made to reconcile them, and it is like enough to be taxed with indifference to principle, or with genuine regard for neither. Party-spirit is too apt to regard truth as a Siren. When both sides have so long affected to be quarrelling over first-principles, may it not be rational to suggest, that the very tenacity with which they have clung to them shows that neither side can have taken up positions that are wholly false, while neither side should be willing to retain any portion of them that is not true? Now, should their principles admit of accommodation, surely they are no longer justified in standing aloof? 'Sirs, ye are brethren: why do ye wrong one to another?' is a form of appeal that would in all probability be disregarded by the authorities of the Church of England, and of the Catholic Church, alike; yet brethren they are still, and ever will be, as baptized Christians. On that one point all are agreed: 'Vestigia nulla retrorsum.' Thus far, no closing of the gates is permissible on either side to the bitterest controversialist. For any extension of that opening we must be content both to wait and to work in faith—otherwise we may increase the number of divisions in promoting unity. Our best way of contributing to it is to get into the habit of

representing facts as they are, without exaggerating or suppressing any, and letting them tell their own unvarnished tale. When the whole truth is fairly before the world, which it is not yet, men will glide into their conclusions insensibly; and authority will be invited to ratify what people will have long anticipated in their own minds as individuals.

§ 92. *Unearthly Side of Church-history. Authentic History due to Revelation.*

For those who are perplexed or scandalised by the divisions of Christendom—for those who are disquieted by the sceptical objections which are flying about to one part after another in detail of revealed truth, it may be more relief than is supposed generally, to accustom themselves to regard it as a whole from first to last, and with the general effect belonging to it, which is not of man, but of God. Let them look at it, I say, as most people have, at some period or other of their lives, looked at that masterpiece of genius and art combined, the picture of the Transfiguration, by Raphael—with their gaze withdrawn from that lower compartment, where the wild ravings of the maniac are seen portrayed with superhuman skill, and concentrated upon that sublime scene above—where Deified Humanity is enshrined in majesty, and where the floating figures on the right and left impersonate both the attitude and the feelings of unwavering trust, unbounded reverence, and serene repose, which in such august presence we should wish our own.

Such unearthliness it is that we shall find stamped upon the mighty diorama of revealed history, unrolled to the extent that it has been in our own days, and stretching back with its miles of canvass to the first Adam. Whatever else the Old Testament may be—whatever else it may never have assumed to be, two things may be predicated of it with certainty. First, it is the Church-history of mankind before Christ: secondly, as containing the message of God to man, it has been the parent of all authentic history of mankind in any shape. Here are two points in which the history of

Revelation differs essentially from all others, and stands alone in its claims. It starts from the earliest records of our race; and we see plainly that it will not end with ourselves. Not only is there no other history that ascends so high or, preserving its identity, descends so low; but all other records, whether of ages or nations, have, as it were, been summoned into life at its bidding, and been dependent on it. It is the message of God to man that has made history authentic, and the records of mankind worth preserving. As long as revealed religion was confined to a single nation or family, the records of that nation or family were the only records of humanity that were kept, or that have survived in any regular series, except so far as we may ourselves have deduced one from casual inscriptions traced upon monuments, or from monuments without inscriptions. As time advanced—as that message was about to be made known to all comers, other nations, hitherto lost in obscurity, began to be solicitous about the fate of their records, and to aim at having authentic histories of their own. Those who attained to the highest perfection in that art were precisely those whose services Revelation was about to appropriate, with world-wide effect, for its forthcoming phase. The captivities of Israel and Judah, and their dispersion into foreign lands, gave the signal for authentic histories to commence elsewhere. The foundations of civilisation in Ancient Greece and Rome were advancing rapidly. As Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi closed the canon of the Old Testament, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon supplied models of authentic history for those nations into whose keeping the dispensation of the New Testament had been designed to pass. No really authentic histories of any Gentile people before Christ exist but those of Greece and Rome. Even their histories cease to be authentic beyond that point where that of the Jews ends; and it is precisely Greece and Rome that have become synonymes for the two great branches of Christendom.

Their civilisation, unlike that of Egypt and Assyria, of China, the Indian peninsula, and Mexico—of who knows how many more countries in East and West—was not destined to

pass away and be forgotten in its decay. Memorials of it were to be written; and memorials of it, written or unwritten, were to be preserved with the records of Christianity; and all that was good in their literature, arts, or sciences, was destined to be regenerated by contact with the Gospel, and live. Other nations, when their time came, obeyed the same law. Germans, Franks, Scandinavians, all commenced having a history from the period of their conversion to Christianity, or but a short time before, when they were on the road to it. Since their regeneration—since their civilisation by it, what histories have they not had; and in what fulness!—histories, not only of their own wars and dynasties, but of the progress of art, science, and literature among them, and in the world generally; histories by them, in how many cases, of nations that passed away without any history of their own but what has been disentombed from their monuments. What has stamped authenticity upon our records—has been the principle both of life and endurability in all our histories—is the message of God to man: in other words, their connection with Christianity. They have been written either by Christians, or have subserved Christian purposes. If it were not so, how has it happened that in the course of six thousand years they have come to be the only works of the kind extant: so that neither Egypt nor Assyria, China nor India, Europe nor America, can produce any such authentic records of their primeval or Gentile state; though of monuments there still remains no lack—in many cases of colossal proportions—attesting immense skill and energy on the part of former races that must have once inhabited those countries, but of whom no further records are to be found? Mohammedans are the only people, besides Jews and Christians, that have preserved any records of their past; and they magnify rather than abate the force of the contrast. Their plagiarisms from the Law and from the Gospel were very great; their relations with Jews and Christians ever since have been incessant. But place their records side by side with the records of Christian Europe, and Asia, and America, down to our own age, and what comparison can there possibly be between

them, except so far as illustrating the manifold superiority of the one to the other? Nowhere in his unregenerate state —except as preparatory to his regeneration, or as in some way derivable from it—has man preserved any regular records of his own existence. Till God took him in hand he was not conscious, or rather he was distrustful, of his own dignity; neither was he careful about perpetuating his own memory. The Bible was the first attempt of the kind made in his behalf, as fraught with the message of God to him, and with the scheme for effecting his recovery. It commenced with the creation, fall, and punishment of the first Adam; it ended with the Incarnation, Death, and Ascension of the second Adam. All else is intermediate, but in strict relation to its own subject-matter—namely, the progress of mankind under revealed religion. Before Christ, while they formed the only authentic history in the world, those records, even in their purely historical aspect, were in the nature of a sacred trust. Since Christ there has been no need of regulating or preserving the historical records of the Church by any special provision, analogous to the means for regulating and preserving its doctrine. Christian nations are left to take care of their own histories—Christian writers of that of the Church. No inspired penmen are needed to record the different ages of the Gospel, as of the Law. Christianity is destined to be final, as far as the present world is concerned; it has no future to reach forward into but its own; it will not be supplanted by any ulterior dispensation. In the Old Testament the records of both history and doctrine were inspired alike, because they were designed alike for purposes beyond their own and immediate one. Both had to serve as precedents, types, figures, shadows of that more perfect dispensation to which they pointed in the dark future. When we are writing a history of literature, we touch but lightly upon political events; when we are treating of the constitutional history of a country, we do not draw glowing pictures of its campaigns; when we are giving the physical history of a country, we pass over its laws, politics, and wars without a word. Here God was dictating a history for the purposes of His own scheme

of Revelation, and of which He alone knew beforehand what the sequel would be. The Old Testament, therefore, being the Church-history of all ages before Christ, and neither more nor less, was composed from first to last under His Inspiration, by Whom the whole history of the post-Christian period was foreseen and foredetermined; and it would be as natural for all events which are recorded there to be in character with its leading idea, as for all ceremonies which are prescribed there to be typical of those of the Gospel. Look at it in this point of view, side by side with the history of the Church. Both together have all the appearance of a consistent whole. The two systems fit into each other perfectly — the last as having taken the mould of the first: 'Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet: Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet.' Its ordinances elevated and carried on in the Christian sacraments; its external developments in Church and State, even to its corruptions and the judgments entailed by those corruptions, one after another finding their counterpart in the successive vicissitudes of the Christian Church. With the Books of Joshua and Judges, of Kings and Chronicles, spread open before him, nobody can complain of the want of a clue to the current of events in Church-history: with the books of Moses and the Prophets spread open before him, nobody can complain of the want of a clue to the Ritual, both in its primitive and in its more expanded form, of the Church. There is the same analogy between the Law and the Gospel that Bishop Butler has shown so irresistibly to exist between Nature and Revelation. And, viewed as a whole, the historical argument encircling Revelation is of that character that it must either stand, or all authentic history must fall with it. All the arguments in the world against isolated details in either branch of it are worthless in presence of that indissoluble connection by which both branches are knit together in the collective series.

§ 93. *Same Subject continued. Interdependence of Jewish and Church-history.*

For the history of Christianity can no more be dissevered from that of the Jews than the history of the Jews from Christianity. They are not two distinct nor yet two collateral histories; they are literally but the first and second parts of one uninterrupted history. Each of them has its own collateral evidences: that of the Old Testament in the uninspired accounts of Josephus and Philo amongst Jews—in the narratives of Tacitus, and Suetonius, and others amongst Gentiles; that of the New Testament in all the histories of the world—Pagan, Christian, and Mohammedan—that have appeared subsequently to its publication: such collateral evidences as are to be found for the history of England in Cæsar, Lucan, Tacitus amongst ancients, and the historians of France, Germany, Spain, Italy amongst moderns: such collateral evidences as are common to all other nations, often supplementary to, as well as confirmatory of, native records. But the history of the Jews and that of the Christian Church, independently of any such adventitious supports of their own, together make up one history; the strongest proof of whose authenticity lies not in their separate evidences from extraneous sources, but in their own unparalleled interdependence, and witness to each other. The history of a colony and of a mother-country is not apt to be characterised by any such affinity: for what is there, even now, in the constitution of the United States, or in the private habits of the people composing them, which is looked upon in the light of a sacred inheritance from England? Even the later and earlier periods in a history of the same country are dissimilar by comparison; for by what practical tie but that of soil and origin are we connected with our Anglo-Saxon forefathers? But in the Church there has been, from the first, that amount of deliberate purpose to be the spiritual embodiment of the whole Law of Moses as was never exceeded by the Jews themselves in fulfilling the letter. Tradi-

tions of the remote past have not only been preserved with reverence, but they have been guaranteed, by the form in which they have been preserved, against any possibility of surrender to the latest future. It is a majestic policy both of conservatism and yet of progress which reigns throughout, exemplified by no other history on the same scale. The retrospective testimony which is lent by Christianity to the history of the Jews is as old as Christianity itself; the prospective testimony which the history of the Jews lends to Christianity is contemporaneous with the first records of the human race.

§ 94. *One History but not the History of One People. Testimony of the Jews to Christianity.*

Finally, one history though it has been shown to be, it is not the history of one people. Never was there any history more completely one—never were there parties to any one history more completely two. The Jews, to this day, will not allow the authenticity of their own national records to be disputed; but it is for the benefit of a religion that has supplanted their own. And Christians appeal to those same records, in confirmation of their own faith, which prove their forefathers to have been a race of idolaters. The Jew may refer with pride to the mighty achievements of his ancient progenitors; still he cannot deny the fact that they lived and worked and spoke much more for aliens than for their own descendants. Christians, on the other hand, are laid under the necessity of confessing their obligations through life to a race which, in the classical literature of Ancient Greece and Rome, is never mentioned but with scorn; and which, since the coming of Christ and its rejection of Him, has been treated everywhere with the same scorn redoubled by the whole world. Had the whole nation of the Jews embraced Christianity, what a gigantic system of fraud and collusion would it not have been denounced by the rest of mankind! Had Christianity contained no reference to the Law of Moses, the Jews might have been justified in adhering to the latter.

Had the Jews shrunk from, or given up in disgust, the task of authenticating their own records, they would have deprived Christianity of that unique species of testimony both to its truth, and to their own condemnation in rejecting it, which they have now for so many centuries been bearing about the world in their own persons.

§ 95. *Divisions in the Hand of God. Testimonies to the Truth of the Gospel.*

Such are the marvellous consequences, in the hands of God, of divisions originating in or aggravated by the sin of man! The antagonism between Jews and Christians, the antagonism between Christendom in East and West, the antagonism between Mohammedanism and Christian theology in the East, between Protestantism and Christian anthropology in the West, might never have existed at all but for sin in each case; but there is not one of them which has not proved beneficial to the progress, attestation, or illustration of that Divine Economy, whose fixed purpose from the beginning has been the redemption of the world through God made Man. In our fallen state, our testimony is apt to be much more unexceptionable when we are divided amongst ourselves than when we are united. We never love truth so much as when it is attacked, and we are put on our defence as believers in it. 'Virtutem incolumem odimus,' as the poet sings. Truth profits by our divisions in more ways than one. Sometimes it is admitted as a fact on both sides, in which case its authenticity is made doubly sure; sometimes its full meaning would never have been elicited, owing to our dulness or indifference, but for some deliberate attempt to palm a false meaning upon it. The Jews who rejected Christ, and the Mohammedans who abjured Him, alike testify to the fact of His existence. Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans alike testify to the historical truth of the Old Testament, which foretold Him. Eastern and Western Christendom alike testify to His Incarnation as the Son of God. Easterns and Westerns, Protestants and Catholics, alike testify to the

genuineness of the New Testament, in which that fact is recorded. There is no reason to suppose that the progress of controversy has been to obscure the meaning of those Scriptures, to which all Christians appeal, or to doubt but that the end of it will be to ensure the acceptance of their true meaning by all Christians. There is even consolation in the thought that it must always be more creditable for Christians to be divided than to be indifferent about their religion. To agree and be in earnest is their ideal state: but better a thousand times for the 'odium theologicum' to be manifested in excess on both sides, than for neither side to have any conscience or interest in what they believe! People are most jealous of what they value most. For those who are practical believers in what Christ has done for man, there can be no subject of more rational enthusiasm, in the full sense of that word, than what concerns His honour. It can be no bigotry to assert that 'Glory to God' is a consideration entitled to take precedence over 'peace on earth.'

§ 96. *Benefits of Christianity. Reply of Miramolin to King John.*

Ingratitude was punished by the Ancient Persians as a crime. I neither envy the disingenuousness of those who, with the page of history spread open before them, are slow to admit that it is Christianity which has enabled man to attain to his present perfection—so far beyond any former precedent—nor the apathy of those who grant the fact, and yet are not solicitous for the spread and maintenance of that noble religion among their fellow-creatures to the latest age. That it has not done more for us has been the fault of our forefathers and of ourselves. Even now, we are risking all that we have by undervaluing our obligations to it, by pluming ourselves upon our own self-sufficiency, and imagining that we could do without it and not fare the worse. 'I taught Ephraim to go, taking them by their arms, but they knew not that I healed them.'[427] . . . *Facilis descensus.*

[427] Hosea xi. 3.

We should experience but little difficulty in parting with all our enlightenment, with all our acquired habits, whether of science or of self-control, and returning to our pristine savagery. See how Mohammedans have succeeded in decivilising themselves, as compared with Protestants; but it has certainly been from no lack of intellect, or of capacity for either refinement or conquest. When our 'lackland' King John communicated his intention of turning Mohammedan to Miramolin, emperor of Morocco, he received from that potentate very different counsel from what he had anticipated. The emperor considered that anyone changing the religion in which he had been born and bred did a very unwise thing: 'and I must tell you,' said he to Robert of London, who had come to him as ambassador from John, 'your king is much to blame for his inconstancy upon this point, and for discovering himself inclined to renounce the admirable institution of Christianity. God Almighty knows that, were I at liberty to choose my persuasion, Christianity should certainly be my religion!'[428]

Miramolin may have been far more favourably impressed with what he had heard or seen of the Crusades as a contemporary, than many who have formed their opinions of them from books; but testimony like this to the superiority of Christianity over the creed of Mohammed is a fact which moderns would do well to study. Christianity has but one aspiration—that of developing and strengthening in man his highest qualities, and of curbing and subduing in man all those propensities which he has in common with beasts. It has many beautiful tendencies, that would exalt humanity to a still higher level, did we but allow them to have full play. It would substitute the law of moral power everywhere for the law of force—the law of love for the law of penalties and prohibitions of any kind. It would abolish capital punishments by rendering the heart of man inaccessible to those crimes which merit them. It would abolish war, by inculcating in every nation those principles and those manners which promote

[428] Collier, *E. H.* vol. ii. p. 437, ed. Straker.

peace. It would abolish slavery, as it has long done amongst Christians themselves, by becoming the religion of all nations, as it was designed to be. It would equalise all ranks, without encouraging insubordination, by reminding all of their respective duties: still admonishing the rich that they have brethren in the poor, and elevating the poor by the thought that heaven is open to them equally with the rich. Oh! what miserable philanthropists we are not to throw ourselves more unreservedly into the teaching of that elevating, humanising, socialising religion; and esteem it to be a real privilege, individually and collectively, to carry out its injunctions, and be the living fulfilment of all its aspirations! There has been nothing to compare with it in past time for the benefits which it has conferred upon man, in every condition or relation of life, public or private—in every species of employment, at home or abroad. It has heightened his intelligence, controlled his passions, inspired him with fellow-feeling for others, hallowed his labours, spiritualised his joys, assuaged his griefs, made home doubly dear to him upon earth, and yet cast a gleam of true sunshine over his deathbed. There is nothing half so ennobling that men can invent or devise for themselves. Let them only take half the trouble, to bring themselves into subjection to it as their ruling principle, which they do to discover some substitute for it that will please their vanity, and they will find that it has capacities for ministering to the good of mankind in a thousand ways of which we are still ignorant, because we have not probed them sufficiently, by putting it to that test. As long as it is contained in 'earthen vessels' it must savour of them to some extent. To be maintained in perpetuity upon earth, its incorporation in some form or other, analogous to the relations of soul and body, was matter of necessity from the first. Left to themselves, unrecorded in books, unembodied in institutions, the grandest ideas are soon lost in air. There is no modern improvement that we do not seek to compass by means of a society; and there is no society that can exist without organisation and administration proportionable to its scope. But the scope of Christianity is world-wide.

§ 97. *The Church as an Instrument for Good. The More Nations in the Church the Better.*

We have our international associations for bringing men together, and divesting them of provincial prejudices, and making them work in concert for the wellbeing of humanity. That spiritual association known as the Church is worth them all for that purpose. It alone has the guarantee of Heaven for assistance from above and permanence upon earth. All that is wanted is that Christians should rally round it and support it to the uttermost, bringing with them as little of the old-man as they can help, and doing as much as they can to neutralise the effect of the old-man in others: never forgetting, however, that it cannot be got rid of in either through life. The Church has suffered grievously from the sins of its members of every grade; still there is no amount of efficiency to which it cannot attain, when all within it are animated by a God-serving spirit to make the best of the advantages which it has to offer. Then it expands to their hands, casts their works into suitable shape, and crowns them with immortality. The Church has suffered considerably when its destinies have been subjected to the control of any one set of men, or swayed too exclusively by any one nationality. The more nations there are that attach themselves to it, the less exclusively will it be attached to any, or estranged from any. There is no amount of kaleidoscopic variety that it is not capable of exhibiting; and it is never so pure, never so glorious, as when the collective genius of all nations is reflected in it, and no one type too predominant. If we can do so without a contradiction in terms, let us try to imagine what the condition and action of the Catholic Church would be, did it ever come to be confined to a single nation of inconsiderable proportions in East, West, North, or South. Then let us extend it in thought to all nations inhabiting one quarter of the globe only. Then let us consider what are its existing circumstances Nobody can fail to perceive that it is the Southern mind which is almost the exclusively domi-

nant influence in it, as compared with that of the North—the Western mind, as compared with that of the East. That different quarters of the globe produce different temperaments of mind will be denied by none. So far, therefore, as minds are concerned, it is very decidedly a reflection of the South and West, much more decidedly than it could or would be were Northern and Eastern nations, by the blessing of God, restored to their pristine footing in it. And so far, therefore, as its action is ever swayed by human elements, it would in that case be very different from what it is, or has been, for centuries—to its incalculable though, perhaps, unavoidable misfortune. The detriment would be the same in kind, were it ever to be restricted to one order or class of men, or even to a disproportion of one sex. Workers it must have, of all tempers and turns of mind, to be thoroughly efficient. It can employ them in any number, in any variety; it does employ them, in point of fact, usually in their own way. Everybody not absolutely blinded by prejudice, must admit that there is no such machinery for good to be found elsewhere.

§ 98. *Christianity has not divided Christians. Unity still dear to the Jews.*

Whatever else may have divided Christians, it is quite certain that Christianity has not, but, on the contrary, that its very essence is Unity. Throughout the New Testament the followers of Christ are contemplated as one family of believers—as brethren of one household. Almost the first remark made upon them by the outside world was, 'See how these Christians love one another!' Unity is one of the deepest and most abiding instincts which belongs to Christians, as such; they can no more exist without it than without their shadow. It haunts them everywhere, like the waking dream that has held them entranced and vanished: it is scarce gone but they begin to grope about for it, in some form or other, bemoaning their loss. If they cannot recover it on a large scale, they hug what remains to them of

it on a small scale all the closer. There is nothing that they set themselves so vigilantly—I had almost said fiercely—to provide against, as any fresh schism. Or, when they cannot find it any longer in the outer world, they invent some fanciful realisation of it in the unseen.

We are the exact antitypes of the Jews in this as in all other respects. It is a quality which belongs exclusively to the people of God, as such, and to which the natural man has never really laid claim. Look at that homeless, outlawed, refugee nation which the wild Bedouin looks down upon as alien from humanity—which Christians even have not yet unlearnt treating with contumely—which has been in so many respects a party consenting to its own abasement by its own sordid acts, yet exhibiting in one respect a spectacle of grandeur in adversity to which the world has no parallel. Where is there such another wailing-place as that of the Jews in Jerusalem? And where else could there be that conflict of emotions which is stirred up by what takes place there, in every mind conversant with their history? Every Friday, between noon and sunset—which is the eve of their Sabbath, and the day and hour of the Crucifixion as well—they collect round the southern extremity of the old western wall, as it is supposed, of their temple: with their faces turned in the direction of the Mount of Olives, where the Saviour wept over their city when He foretold its doom—in the direction of that site known as the 'Ecce Homo,' where the lips of their own forefathers inprecated vengeance on their heads—and there they are to be seen engaged, in every attitude, young and old, rich and poor, week after week, year after year, in the nineteenth century from their dispersion, weeping over it freshly, as though it had been a thing of yesterday, with tears unfeigned, and supplicating the Lord God of their fathers to be given back, in mercy, to their own land, not as so many scattered atoms, but as one people. Where is the nation of antiquity to be found elsewhere thus represented, thus employed, in these days, not so much over the ruins of its metropolis as of its temple? The nearest approach to it, the only fact that exceeds it in some respects, is the unity

that bound Christendom together for a thousand years, and the craving for unity which during the whole eight hundred years or more following has pervaded Christendom. Where is the nation, as such, ancient or modern, that has ever sought to be one with its neighbours, or its antipodes, except by conquest or aggrandisement of some kind or other? To this day nobody can be admitted to the privilege of citizenship in the most enlightened of European nations who is citizen of another country. The baptized Christian is a Christian in all lands; the highest posts of honour and authority in the Catholic Church are open to all nations, and to their meanest citizens. And though divided—hopelessly divided according to some thinkers — Christendom has been for centuries; yet in point of fact, when we look into history, we find that there never has passed one century since its divisions commenced, in which efforts, countless efforts, have not been made for its reunion: attesting even in their failure the strong instinct for unity by which all true Christians are drawn towards each other, when they can have no other motive for it but their Christianity, and showing that the only obstacles to it originate with themselves, from the mixed motives that take possession of them, as men, in their progress towards it—from prejudices that will crop out in spite of the best intentions, and from defective practice.

§ 99. *Hidden Purpose of the Crusades. Councils for the Reunion of Greeks and Latins.*

In spite of the anathema pronounced against Michael Cerularius by the legates of Leo IX., in A.D. 1054, a good deal of the fellow-feeling between East and West underwent no change. Leo had done all in his power to avert the schism; and when, by order of Cerularius, all the Latin churches were closed in the East, the Greek churches at Rome continued open as before.[429] Under Urban II., who trod in the footsteps of the great Hildebrand, every trace of resentment in connection with that schism had disappeared. Forty years

[429] Bened. xiv., 'Ad Missionarios per Orientem Deputatos,' § 5, ap. Bullar. *Ben.* xiv. p. ii. n. 47.

had barely elapsed from its consummation when Peter the Hermit set out on his celebrated pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and heard from the lips of Simeon, patriarch of that city, the sad tale of horrors which his separated brethren in Palestine had to endure from the Turks.[430] On his return, at his preaching—who had nothing but his subject to recommend him—the nations of Europe started up as one man for their deliverance. A week of Crusades, spread over two centuries, may be regarded as so many vibrations of the same chord. Where is there another instance of a whole continent arming and rushing to the defence of another, not only not subject to it, but to some extent its rival in religion—not only not connected with it by any ties of blood, but estranged from it by those unalterable habits of thought and manner which distinguished East and West? Is it any disparagement to the principle which swayed them, that in acting upon it they behaved themselves as men; or that many who joined them did so from lower and opposite motives? 'Siste viator, heroa calcas.' Expeditions that could give birth to such institutions as the Templars and the Knights of Malta—over which S. Bernard could be eloquent and impassioned without misgivings—in which such men as Godfrey de Bouillon led the van, and S. Louis the rear—should be criticised with reverence, even if they stood alone: as it is, they should never be considered apart from those Councils of Clermont, Bari, Lyons, Basle, Florence, which overlapped them, having for their main object the spiritual reunion of Greeks and Latins, as those Crusades had been for their protection against a common foe. The soul of Christendom was made the care of the one as the body of Christendom had been of the other, though both failed of their full purpose.

The fall of Constantinople, so far from affecting that interest in the least unfavourably, rather enhanced it of the two. The fugitive Greeks were received with open arms all over Europe—nowhere more so than at Rome by Nicholas V. Gregory XIII. built colleges there for Greeks, Maronites, and Armenians in communion with the Holy See, but with

[430] Rohrbacker, *Hist.* vol. xiv. p. 526.

the maintenance of their own rituals assured to them in each case.[431] Leo Allatius, who had been educated at the first of these, and who long held the post of librarian at the Vatican, composed a learned work on the Perpetual Agreement between East and West, wishing to prove their doctrines identical. Some of his Western contemporaries in the same spirit, as Grotius and Sancta Clara, endeavoured to reconcile the Confession of Augsburg and the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England with the Tridentine Decrees. As soon as European embassies came to be regularly established at Constantinople, Western and Eastern Christendom were brought into close contact once more, and began to avail themselves of it as if by instinct. There was hot rivalry between Catholics and Protestants for the goodwill of the East, which alternately fraternised with both, but would on the whole join neither against the other. Josaphat II., patriarch of Constantinople, entered into correspondence with Melancthon: Crusius and Andrea, theologians of Tubingen, addressed Jeremiah II., patriarch of that city between A.D. 1574–81; but his answers to them, which the Greeks have since invested with great authority, were of the most unfavourable description.[432]

Cyril Lucar, acting upon opposite views, engaged—to his cost, as it turned out afterwards—in active negotiations with England and Holland.[433] One of his pupils, Metrophanes Critopulus, was placed by him under the care of Archbishop Abbot, and sent by the latter to Oxford, where he passed several years; and eventually rose to be Patriarch of Alexandria, in which capacity he joined the rest of the East in condemning his patron Cyril. Colleges at Oxford, Paris, and Halle were opened successively for Greek students,[434] though they were not destined to be long-lived. Proposals for reunion, though they were not destined to be successful, were received, within ten years of each other, from some doc-

[431] Bened. xiv. ut sup. § 14: 'In quibus alumnos dictarum nationum educari voluit, ita tamen ut semper in suis ritibus Orientalibus perseverarent.'

[432] Alzog, *Hist.* § 358; Blackmore's *Doctrine of the Russian Church*, introd. p. xv.

[433] Neale's *Eastern Church* (Alexandria), vol. ii p. 411 *et seq.*

[434] *Union Review*, Sept. 1863, Frag. Var. No. 1.

tors of the Sorbonne in Paris, and from some British bishops, by the Russian Church in the reign of Peter the Great.[435] Gregory XIII. received overtures from Russia which induced him to send Father Possevin, the celebrated Jesuit, into that country. His mission bore no immediate fruits; but one result of it was the formation there of the Uniate Church, in A.D. 1593–4.[436]

It was announced to Clement VIII. as the return of the whole Russian Church[437]—which indeed it purported to be, on the terms prescribed by the Council of Florence—to communion with Rome. But there was a reaction on the part of the majority of the Russian clergy, as there had been of the Greeks after that council; and, in point of fact, it never extended beyond the churches of Lithuania. Our own days have witnessed another counter-movement to it, threatening, if not effecting, its annihilation,[438] even in those parts. There are still, however, and there have always been, some sections of the different Eastern denominations in communion with the Holy See; and the terms required of them have been those of the Council of Florence, without exception, to which the Easterns subscribed at the time. In all other respects they have been tenderly dealt with, and allowed to retain their own rights and usages, even to the continuance of their priests in the married state;[439] and Rome has never ceased to labour for the restoration of East and West to their pristine unity.[440]

§ 100. *Projected Reunions in the West. Failures ever followed by Fresh Attempts.*

The Catholic Church in the West, and those bodies which separated from it, have been in a constant state of oscillation

[435] Mouravieff's *Russian Church*, pp. 277 and 286 (Blackmore's *Tr.*).

[436] Ibid. p. 122; Alzog, *Hist.* § 359.

[437] Rohrbacker, *Hist.* vol. xxv. p. 632; on the other side Mouravieff, p. 139 *et seq.*

[438] Mouravieff. Append. p. 430 *et seq.*

[439] Ben. xiv., Bullar. tom. i. No. 57, § 7, p. 197. Compare No. 87, § 19, p. 329 *et seq.*, and tom. iii. pt. ii. No. 47, § 13.

[440] Besides the earnest appeal of the Encyclic of A.D. 1848 (see *Christian Remembrancer*, July 1851, p. 209), a commission of cardinals is said to be engaged on this very subject at the present time.

one towards another ever since the Reformation. It has been a period of unrest and perplexity throughout; everyone affecting independence, but no one side being really at ease, and no one side being able to hit upon any successful expedient for mending matters. Inquisitions have been tried, penal statutes have been tried, and been abandoned. Religious tests, one after another, in abundance and in variety —some stringent, some prolix, some involved, and some equivocal—have been tried, and are still in force. Have they succeeded — the object of them all having been to prevent any further divisions, and to unite that body of Christians, at all events, subscribing to them more closely than ever? Negotiations have been tried—all parties have endeavoured to unite with all by turns; but no two parties have ever once succeeded in amalgamating, even under pressure from the State. There have been fresh secessions from the Catholic Church—fresh divisions amongst those who originally separated from it; but every attempt to bring divided Christendom together again has failed. There have been negotiations between. Catholics and Lutherans, Catholics and Anglicans, Lutherans and Anglicans, Calvinists and Anglicans, Calvinists and Lutherans, Calvinists and Catholics. There have always been two parties in the Church of England—one drawn towards Rome, the other towards Dissent or Puritanism. Except that modern device of the Evangelical Church in Prussia, it has never been found possible to unite any two of them in a single kingdom. Charles V., Ferdinand I., and Maximilian II. successively tried it in Germany; Francis I. and Henri IV. in France; Uladislas in Poland; James I. and Charles II. in England—but all signally failed. The Conference of Ratisbon, in A.D. 1541, was the nearest approach to it ever made, but at that date the breach between Catholics and Protestants was not complete. It might possibly have succeeded could Cardinal Contarini have been in two places at the same time; and had it succeeded, the Council of Trent might have never met.[441] When it fell through,

[441] Ranke is well worth reading on all this: vol. i. pp. 154–71, Mrs. Austin's *Tr.*

conferences themselves got a bad name, which has been never effaced. Neither at Poissy (A.D. 1561) nor Fontainebleau (A.D. 1600), nor Hampton Court (A.D. 1603) nor the Savoy (A.D. 1661), nor Dort (A.D. 1618) nor Thorn (A.D. 1645), was any real progress made towards appeasing dissensions, or restoring unity. Then it was left to good men to argue the question as individuals, and with each other. If they did no more than elucidate points under dispute, acknowledge some of their own prejudices unfounded, express sympathy for their neighbours, they performed some service. But, for their pains, they were requited with the usual reward of peacemakers. Some were dubbed Romanisers, some Gallicans or Jansenists, some Arminians, and some Calvinists—till their patience was exhausted, and all their influence for good undermined. As if, in a matter of such intense party-spirit, it was not matter of congratulation that there should be some men favourable to any one party not their own: or as if there could ever be any collective movement without preliminary commencements in some quarter or other. That they should have failed, and failed so often, can excite no wonder. But how is it that the same thing should have been attempted by so many Christians of different communions and rival creeds? How is it that, in every generation where there has been the least religious ardour or activity, Christians should be found attempting the same thing over and over again in hope, notwithstanding that it had over and over again failed? Assuredly, there is some common instinct, irresistible and irrepressible, implanted in all Christians at their Baptism, that will never let them sit still while they are disunited and estranged from each other. They can no more do without the Church than the Church without them. For the whole must suffer from loss of any of its component parts. That they do fail when they come to act upon it is much more their infirmity, or their misfortune, than their fault. Being a principle of the holiest and most godlike nature, there is nothing more readily bedimmed by any taint or tarnish of earth. It is obscured immediately, when Christian communities, estranged from the Church, trade upon it for the pur-

pose of combining or acting in concert against the Church —when authorities of the Church trade upon it for the purpose of aggrandising themselves, or of crushing others—when statesmen or monarchs trade upon it for the purpose of advancing political ends. It is abased and depreciated by all such contact, but it is not put down. It flows perennially from the fountain-head, pure and undefiled; and the pollutions which force themselves upon it in its onward course are no more parts of it than the sewage of our great metropolis is of the Thames. It is this hidden instinct of Christianity that I shall hope to lay bare, by rigid analysis of all those 'projected reunions' that will form the subject of my second volume. They have been far more numerous in every age than is generally supposed: they attest exquisite sympathies belonging to Christianity as such, for which it has never received sufficient homage. They might have succeeded long since but for the dross of earth which I shall be able to show has been mixed up with them in each case. Even in their failures they are valuable, as evidencing how few points there are, in reality, which divide Christians, except their prejudices; and they are still more valuable as evidencing the glorious comprehensive spirit which pervaded the minds of some of the greatest ornaments of Christianity and civilised society combined, that ever lived: of Grotius, Bossuet, and Leibnitz, for instance, who, besides other incomparable works, have bequeathed three, between them, destined to become textbooks in any reunion of Christendom that may be now or at any future time contemplated.[442] Their names and their examples may, perhaps, even bespeak a hearing for me.

[442] 1. The work of Grotius is entitled *Via ad Pacem Ecclesiasticam*, published in A.D. 1642.

2. Bossuet's *Exposition of Faith* was translated, in 1841, for the Catholic Institute of Great Britain.

3. Leibnitz' *Theological System* was translated, in 1850, by Dr. Russell of Maynooth, with a valuable Introduction and Appendix. I shall hope to give a full account of them hereafter.

OCTAVE OF THE EPIPHANY, 1865.

PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE, LONDON

00068218

Digitized with financial assistance from
Government of Maharashtra
on 30 January, 2020